

MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES

Edited by H. CARRINGTON LANCASTER

GUSTAV GRUENBAUM

RAYMOND D. HAVENS

WILLIAM KURRELMAYER

KEMP MALONE

JOSÉ ROBLES

HAZELTON SPENCER

CONTENTS

	PAGE
TILLEY, M. P. and RAY, JAMES K.—Proverbs and Proverbial Allusions in Marlowe,	347
PARKER, WILLIAM R.—Symmetry in Milton's 'Samson Agonistes,'	355
NETTLETON, GEORGE H.—Author's Changes in Dryden's 'Conquest of Granada, Part I,'	360
PARSONS, COLEMAN O.—Dryden's Letter of Attorney,	364
FLETCHER, EDWARD G.—A Dryden Anecdote,	366
BADER, A. L.—The Modena Troupe in England,	367
TALAMON, RENÉ.—La Marquise du 'Bourgeois Gentilhomme,'	369
CENTENO, AUGUSTO.—Sobre el pasaje del 'Quijote' referente al 'Tirant le blanc,'	375
CAMERON, ALICE.—A Note on Desportes and Du Bellay,	378
KURRELMAYER, W.—"Wes das Herz voll ist, des gehet der Mund über,"	380
DAUDON, RENÉ.—L'Accent allemand dans Balzac,	382
FERGUSON, J. DeLANCEY.—The Plot of Conrad's 'The Duel,'	385
WOOD, MIRIAM HATHEWAY.—A Source of Conrad's 'Suspense,'	390
SCHNEIDER, ELIZABETH.—Katherine Mansfield and Chekhov,	394

REVIEWS:—

M. REU, Luther's German Bible. [W. Kurrelmeyer.]	397
R. KLIBANSKY (ed.), Magistri Eckardi Opera Latina. [F. W. Kaufmann.]	401
ELEANOR GERTRUDE BROWN, Milton's Blindness. [W. H. Wilmer.]	402
R. N. CUNNINGHAM, Peter Anthony Motteux, 1663-1718. [L. I. Bredvold.]	403
EDNA C. FREDRICK, The Plot and its Construction in Eighteenth Century Criticism of French Comedy. [Edith Melcher.]	404
OTTO FUNKE, Englische Sprachphilosophie im späteren 18. Jahrhundert. [Ants Oras.]	405
RUTH C. MCKAY, George Gissing and his critic, Frank Swinnerton; A. H. ABLE, 3RD., Meredith and Peacock; E. SCHNEIDER, The Aesthetics of W. Haslitt. [A. E. DuBois.]	407
H. BLODGETT, Walt Whitman in England; F. STOVALL, Walt Whitman. [Leon Howard.]	408
FREDERICK PAGE, Patmore. [O. E. Holloway.]	409
H. REYNOLDS (ed.), Letters to the New Island, by W. B. YATES. [F. W. C. Hersey.]	411

BRIEF MENTION: R. L. EVANS, Les Romantiques français et la Musique; M. E. STORER, Contes de fées; E. CAILLIET, Themes of Magic; VACHEL LINDSAY, The Congo, Kansas, John L. Sullivan; F. R. JOHNSON and S. V. LARKEY, Thomas Digges, the Copernican System, and the Infinity of the Universe; H. C. WYLD, Some Aspects of the Diction of English Poetry; F. I. CARPENTER (ed.), Emerson, A. WARREN (ed.), Hawthorne, O. SHEPARD (ed.), Longfellow,	412
---	-----

BALTIMORE

THE JOHNS HOPKINS PRESS

MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES

A Monthly Publication with intermission from July to October (inclusive)

EDITED BY

H. Carrington Lancaster, Gustav Gruenbaum, W. Kurrelmeyer,
Raymond D. Havens, Kemp Malone, H. Spencer, and J. Robles

ADVISORY EDITORS

G. Chinard, E. Feise, Grace Frank, J. C. French, R. B. Roulston

The Subscription Price of the current annual volume is \$5.00
for the United States and Mexico and \$5.50 for other countries
included in the Postal Union. Single issues, price seventy-five cents.

Contributors and Publishers should send manuscripts and books for review to the Editors of Modern Language Notes, The Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md., indicating on the envelope whether the contribution concerns English, German, or Romance. Every manuscript should be accompanied by a stamped and addressed return envelope. In accepting articles for publication, the editors will give preference to those submitted by subscribers to the journal. Foot-notes should be numbered continuously throughout each article; titles of books and journals should be italicized; titles of articles enclosed in quotation marks. Quotation marks are *not* used in verse quotations that form a paragraph. Write II, 3, *not* vol. II, p. 3. The following abbreviations are approved: *DNB.*, *JEGP.*, *MLN.*, *MLR.*, *MP.*, *NED.*, *PMLA.*, *PQ.*, *RE.*, *SP.*, *RES.*, *TLS.* Proof and MS. should be returned to the *editors* with an indication of the *total* number of reprints desired. Subscriptions and other business communications should be sent to The Johns Hopkins Press, Baltimore, Maryland.

MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES

THIS JOURNAL will complete its fiftieth volume in December 1935. It is quite appropriate to issue a General Index covering volumes 1 to 50. The list of authors, titles and subjects of papers, and cross references will be arranged under one alphabet. The price will be \$5.00 net a copy, and the Index will be distributed in the fall.

THE JOHNS HOPKINS PRESS • BALTIMORE

Entered as Second-Class Matter at the Baltimore, Maryland, Postoffice.
Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103.
Act of Congress of July 16, 1894.

ors
he
ipt
les
the
of
no-
noi
P.,
ors
ess

Modern Language Notes

Volume L

JUNE, 1935

Number 6

PROVERBS AND PROVERBIAL ALLUSIONS IN MARLOWE

The Case edition of Marlowe's works notes so few proverbs or proverbial allusions in Marlowe's seven plays and his *Hero and Leander* as to make it seem that he rejected in the main this favorite Elizabethan device of introducing wit and wisdom in his writings. A reading of his plays and *Hero and Leander* to determine whether this were true, or whether unnoted proverbs might be added to those previously identified, reveals that the editors of his works, up to and including the editors of the Case edition, have underestimated his use of proverbial material.¹

In subsequent paragraphs in this article are given the detailed results of this rereading of Marlowe. They show that to the six proverbs in *The Jew of Malta* and the single proverb in *Edward II* previously identified² are to be added 3, in *Dido, Queen of Carthage*; 1, in *I Tamburlaine*; 4, in *II Tamburlaine*; 4, in *Doctor Faustus*; 11, in *The Jew of Malta*; 8, in *Edward II*; and 4, in *Hero and Leander*.³ None were found in *The Massacre at Paris*.

¹ The term "proverb" in this article is used in its inclusive Elizabethan sense to embrace both popular and learned sayings, whether of native or foreign origin.

² In the Case edition of Marlowe's works six proverbs in *The Jew of Malta* and one in *Edward II* have been noted. In the former the proverbs are: "Of naught is nothing made" (I, ii, 105, p. 54); "Sufferance breeds ease" (I, ii, 239, p. 61); "Blame not me but the proverb Confess and be hanged" (IV, ii, 18-19, p. 126); "Yes, sir; the proverb says, he that eats with the devil had need of a long spoon" (III, iv, 54-55, p. 111); "I'll not have him worth a gray groat" (IV, iv, 122, p. 136); and "Love me little, love me long" (IV, vi, 28, p. 143). In *Edward II*, the proverb noted is, "For now we hold an old wolf by the ears" (V, ii, 7, p. 184).

³ Two of the Marlowe quotations in this article, not proverbial in character, are omitted from this count (*Edward II*, II, ii, 201-202; and *Hero and Leander*, I, 299-302).

In rejecting "such conceits as clownage keeps in pay," Marlowe excluded from his plays, for the greater part, certain types of lowly characters and other types in Elizabethan plays that delight in proverbs. As a result, the witty use of proverbs to enliven the dialogue, so frequently found in Shakespeare and other Elizabethan dramatists, is lacking almost altogether in Marlowe. Marlowe's employment of proverbs, as one would expect from the serious nature of his plays, is confined mainly to those "old truths" in which his characters find support for their views or comfort for their woes. In this connection it is noteworthy that a considerable number of his sayings are classical in origin rather than native, and are given, at times, in their Latin form, although English translations of the same proverbs were not uncommon in his day. Had Marlowe also written comedies instead of confining himself to plays of a tragic character—as he might have done had he lived longer—it is likely that he would have employed more proverbs in the lighter manner in which Pilia-Borza employs two proverbs in *The Jew of Malta*.⁴

DIDO, QUEEN OF CARTHAGE⁵

P. 152 (II, i, 84-85). "*Dido*. Aeneas is Aeneas, were he clad In weeds as bad as ever Irus wore." In *The Jew of Malta* (IV, vi, 10), Marlowe has "A man's a man." These words of Marlowe's in *The Jew of Malta* are a shortened form of the proverb, "A man is a man, though he have but a hose on his head" (Apperson, p. 394). Apperson⁶ thinks that this proverb "may mean that a man is not to be judged by his apparel, however grotesque that may be." In the passage in *Dido*, Marlowe, by completely rephrasing the proverb, confirms the correctness of Apperson's interpretation of its meaning.

P. 185 (III, iii, 63-65). "*Iar*. Ay, this it is which wounds me to the death, To see a Phrygian, *far-fet* o' the sea, Preferr'd before a man of majesty." In referring in this passage to Dido's preference for Aeneas "*far-fet* o' the sea," Marlowe alludes to the proverb, "*Far-fet* and dear

⁴ For Pilia-Borza's use of proverbs in this manner see *The Jew of Malta*, III, iv, 54-55: "He that eats with the devil had need of a long spoon"; and, IV, iv, 21: "Hodie tibi, cras mihi."

⁵ The page references to passages quoted from Marlowe's works in this article are to *The Works and Life of Christopher Marlowe*, General Editor: R. H. Case.

⁶ G. L. Apperson, *English Proverbs and Proverbial Phrases*, London and New York, 1929. References to this, and other works in this article (with one exception noted in footnote 7), will be by name of author only.

bought is good for ladies" (Apperson, p. 203, and *Elizabethan Proverb Lore*,⁷ p. 144). Massinger in *The Guardian*, II, iv (*Works of Massinger*, ed. F. Cunningham, p. 470) has an allusion to the proverb in a situation similar to that in *Dido*: "[The man she loves is] a mere stranger, Newly arrived!—Still the more probable, Since ladies, as you know, affect strange dainties And brought far to them."

P. 223 (v, i, 165-166). "*Dido*. O *serpent*, that came creeping from the shore, And I for pity *harbour'd in my bosom*." These words stem from the classical proverb, "*Viperam in sinu alere*." See Otto,⁸ p. 372; and Düringsfeld,⁹ I, 213. The proverb is not uncommon in Shakespeare's time, although Apperson does not record it before Ray (1670).¹⁰

I TAMBURLAINE

P. 124 (III, ii, 96). "*Agyd*. And of extremities elect the least." This is Marlowe's version of the proverb, "Of two evils choose the least" (Apperson, p. 654; and *E. P. L.*, p. 138). See Otto (p. 207) for classical instances of the proverb.

II TAMBURLAINE

P. 220 (III, i, 28-31). "*Call*. proud *Fortune* who hath followed long The martial sword of mighty Tamburlaine, Will now retain her old *inconstancy* And raise our honours to as high a pitch." Marlowe here alludes to the oft-repeated sixteenth-century thought that "fortune is constant only in inconstancy." It goes back to Ovid's *Tristia* (v, viii, 18): "Et [*fortuna*] tantum constans in levitate est." For its use by John Lyly and other Elizabethans, see *E. P. L.*, p. 107. Additional examples are found in Sidney, *Arcadia*, lib. I, ch. iv (ed. Feuillerat, p. 26); Peele, *The Battell of Alcazar*, II, iii (Malone Society Reprint, sig. C i verso); Dekker, *I Honest Whore*, II, i, 400-401 (ed. W. A. Neilson, in *C. E. D.*); and Marston, *The Malcontent*, I, vi, 107-108 (ed. W. A. Neilson, in *C. E. D.*). Apperson does not record this recurring Elizabethan thought.

P. 227 (III, ii, 107-108). "*Tamb.* Filling their empty veins with airy wine, That, being concocted, turns to crimson blood." The idea that "wine makes blood" was proverbial. James Howell has it in his "Letter Com-

⁷ M. P. Tilley, *Elizabethan Proverb Lore in Lyly's "Euphues" and in Pettie's "Petite Pallace,"* New York, 1926. This work will be referred to hereafter as "*E. P. L.*"

⁸ A. Otto, *Die Sprichwörter und Sprichwörtlichen Redensarten der Römer*, Leipzig, 1890.

⁹ Ida und Otto von Düringsfeld, *Sprichwörter der Germanischen und Romanischen Sprachen*, Leipzig, 1872.

¹⁰ Shakespeare alludes to the proverb in *II Henry VI* (III, i, 343-344), and *Richard II* (III, ii, 131). Not noted in Jente, *The Proverbs of Shakespeare*, Washington University Studies, XIII (1926). Chapman employs it in *Bussy D'Ambois*, III, ii, 386-387 (ed. W. A. Neilson, in *The Chief Elizabethan Dramatists*).

posed of *French Proverbs*" in his *Tetraglotton*: "In the morning white wine is good, Claret at night to breed good blood." The origin of this belief can be traced to Homer (P. A. Robin, *The Old Physiology in English Literature*, pp. 107-108). The thought is repeated in *The Civile Conversation of M. Steven Guazzo*, bk. iv (Tudor Translations, II, 161); Nicholas Breton, *II Crossing of Proverbs* (ed. A. B. Grosart, II, 11); Sylvester, *The Complete Works of Joshua Sylvester* (ed. Grosart, I, 45, 588-593); *Everie Woman in her Humour* (Tudor Facsimile Text, sig. G 4 verso). Shakespeare in *Much Ado about Nothing* (I, i, 230-231), and Spenser in *The Faerie Queene* (v, vii, 10) employ it. For further examples, see P. A. Robin, *loc. cit.*; and "Good Drink Makes Good Blood," in *MLN.*, xxxix (1924), 153-155. Not in Apperson.

P. 273 (v, iii, 64-65). "*Tech.* this grief will cease, And cannot last, it is so violent." The proverb, "Nothing that is violent is permanent," occurs in collections of English proverbs, and frequently in the literature of Marlowe's time. Instances of its use by Shakespeare and others are cited in *E. P. L.*, p. 317. The proverb goes back to Aristotle, *Aristotelis Sententiae . . . Selectissimae* (1556), 71: "Nullum violentum est perpetuum." It is not in Apperson. See in this article the quotation from *The Jew of Malta* (I, i, 130-131), for a second use of the proverb by Marlowe.

P. 280 (v, iii, 238-239). "*Tamb.* The nature of these proud rebelling jades Will take occasion by the slenderest hair." The classical proverb, "Fronte capillata, post est occasio calva" (Otto, p. 249), is the source of two related English proverbs, "Occasion is bald behind" (Apperson, p. 462), and "To take time by the forelock" (Apperson, p. 635). In *E. P. L.* (p. 238), illustrations from Shakespeare and others are given. See in this article the quotation from *The Jew of Malta* (v, ii, 44), for a second allusion to the proverb by Marlowe.

DOCTOR FAUSTUS

P. 60 (I, i, 48-49). "*Faust.* What doctrine call you this, *che sera, sera*: 'What will be, shall be.'" Apperson (p. 560) notes the proverb, "That which shall be, shall be," from the time of Chaucer onward; and Düringsfeld (II, 200) illustrates the general currency of the proverb on the continent. It is found in *Romeo and Juliet* (IV, i, 21), not cited by Jente. As further evidence of the popularity of the proverb in Elizabethan literature, see Pettie, *A Petite Pallace* (ed. I. Gollancz, II, 128); Chettle, *Kind-Heart's Dream* (*Early English Poetry*, Percy Society ed., v, 37); Peele, *The Old Wives Tale* (ll. 62-63, in *C. E. D.*); *II Return from Parnassus*, II, v, 726-729; Nashe, *Letter to Cotton* (*Works*, v, 196, ed. McKerrow); Jonson, *Epicoene*, v, iv, 107; Beaumont and Fletcher, *The Scornful Lady*, III, i, 278-279; and *A Merrie Dialogue betweene Band, Cuffe, and Ruffe* (ed. J. O. Halliwell, p. 16). It is also found in the following collections of English proverbs: Bacon, *Promos* (ed. H. Pott, p. 525); Howell, *Italian Proverbs* in his *Tetraglotton*; Lean²¹ (IV, 180); and G. Torriano, *Italian Proverbs*

²¹ V. S. Lean, *Collectanea*, Bristol, 1902.

and *Proverbial Phrases* (1666, p. 81). See in this article the quotation from *Edward II* (iv, vi, 94), for a second use of the proverb by Marlowe.

P. 82 (II, i, 42). "*Meph. Solamen miseris socios habuisse doloris.*" The English form of this classical proverb, "Misery loves company," is repeatedly met with in Shakespeare and his contemporaries (see *E. P. L.*, p. 229; and Apperson, p. 110). Amorphus, in *Cynthia's Revels* (v, iv, 605-606), offers a variation of the proverb: "When men disgraces share, The lesser is the care."

P. 140 (iv, iii, 95). "*Fred. He must needs go that the devil drives.*" This is one of the commonest of sixteenth-century English proverbs. See Apperson, p. 440, and Jente, p. 411.

P. 142 (iv, iv, 26). "*Benv. We'll rather die with grief than live with shame.*" This is Marlowe's restatement of the Latin proverb, "*Melius est mori quam male vivere,*" See Lean, III, 432. It is also found in the following plays: Kyd, *Cornelia*, iv, ii, 133-135; *Locrine*, iv, i, 134-135 (ed. Tucker Brooke, in *The Shakespeare Apocrypha*); and *Apus and Virginia* (Hazlitt's *Dodsley*, iv, 144). See the quotation in this article from *Edward II* (III, iii, 58-59), for a second instance in Marlowe of this proverb.

THE JEW OF MALTA

P. 33 (Prol., l. 27). "*Bar. Let me be envied and not pitied.*" For the proverb, "Better be envied than pitied," see Apperson, p. 42, and Düringsfeld, I, 91. Erasmus, in his *Adagia* (ed. 1703, 1044B), comments on the proverb as follows: "*Nihil tam vulgari sermone jactatum, quam haec sententia: Praestat invidiosum esse quam miserabilem. Nam invidia fere comes est felicitatis, miseratio calamitatis.*"

P. 44 (I, i, 130-131). "*Bar. and nothing violent, Oft have I heard tell, can be permanent.*" See the note in this article on *II Tamburlaine* (v, iii, 64-66), for comment on this proverb.

P. 48 (I, i, 187). "*Bar. Ego mihi met sum semper proximus.*" The English form of the proverb is, "I am nearest to myself." See *E. P. L.*, p. 235. Apperson (p. 557) records only a single late example (1913) of the proverb in a modified form: "Self first, and then your next best friend." Two instances of the proverb are found in Jonson: *Cynthia's Revels* (v, vii, 29), "as every one is nearest to himselfe"; and *Sejanus* (iv, ii, 9-10), "the thoughts borne nearest Unto our selves, move swiftest still, and dearest."

P. 56 (I, ii, 154). "*Bar. Your extreme right does me exceeding wrong.*" The source of the proverb, "The extremity of law is extremity of wrong," is the classical quotation, "*Summum jus, summa injuria factum est jam tritum sermone proverbium*" (Cicero, *De Officiis*, i, 10). See Apperson, p. 272; and *E. P. L.*, p. 139. Further examples of its use are found in Cyril Tourneur, *The Revenger's Tragedy*, I, ii (ed. J. C. Collins, p. 17); and Richard Edwards, *Damon and Pythias* (ed. J. Q. Adams, in *Chief Pre-Shakespearean Dramas*, II, 753-754).

P. 61 (I, ii, 237-238). "*Bar. No, Abigail; things past recovery Are*

hardly cur'd with exclamations." For the proverb, "Past cure past care," see Apperson, p. 484; and *E. P. L.*, p. 115.

P. 94 (II, iii, 294). "*Bar.* Win it and wear it." Illustrations of the proverb, "Win it and wear it," are given by Apperson, p. 688; *E. P. L.*, p. 326; and Jente, p. 440. Marlowe employs the proverb in his version of a line in Ovid's *Elegia* (II, xii, 13): "I, guide and soldier, *won the field and wear her.*" The thought expressed in the proverb does not occur in the Latin.

P. 131 (IV, iv, 21). "*Pilia.* whom I saluted with an old hempen proverb, *Hodie tibi, cras mihi.*" Apperson (p. 637) cites the proverb, "Today me, tomorrow thee," from the thirteenth century on.

P. 142 (IV, vi, 10). "*Ith.* Rivo Castiliano! *A man's a man.*" See the note in this article on *Dido, Queen of Carthage* (II, i, 84-85), for comment on this proverb.

P. 142 (IV, vi, 14). "*Ith.* Do nothing; but *I know what I know*; he's a murderer." The proverb, "I know what I know," is a shortened form of Heywood's older proverb, "I wot what I wot, though I few words make." See Apperson, p. 714. James Howell includes the proverb in his *Tetraglotton*, p. 18. It is found in one form or another in five of Shakespeare's plays: *The Comedy of Errors* (III, i, 11); *All's Well That Ends Well* (V, iii, 253); *Measure for Measure* (III, ii, 156); *Othello* (V, ii, 301); and *King Lear* (I, v, 16). It also occurs in the following Elizabethan dramas: *Three Ladies of London* (Hazlitt's *Dodsley*, VI, 310); *The True Chronicle History of King Leir* (Tudor Facsimile Text, C 3 verso); Chettle, Haughton, and Dekker's *Patient Grisill* (Tudor Facsimile Text, K 2 recto); *Club Law*, II, ii, 705-706 (ed. G. C. M. Smith); *The London Prodigal*, III, ii, 118-120 (ed. Tucker Brooke, in *The Shakespeare Apocrypha*); Thomas Heywood, *If You Know Not Me You Know Nobody*, II, iii (ed. W. J. Blew, pp. 91-92); Day, *Humour out of Breath* (ed. A. H. Bullen, III, p. 33); and Rowley, *A Match at Midnight*, II, i (Hazlitt's *Dodsley*, XIII, 28). The proverb is also found in John Tatham, *The Rump* (II, i, p. 22); and in *The Bragadocio* (p. 40, ed. 1691). Not in Jente.

P. 154 (V, ii, 44). "*Bar.* Begin betimes; Occasion's bald behind." See the note in this article on *II Tamburlaine* (V, iii 238-239), for comment on the proverb.

P. 155 (V, ii, 72-73). "*Bar.* For, as a friend not known but in distress, I'll rear up Malta, now remediless." Apperson (p. 237), under the proverb, "A friend is never known till a man have need," cites examples of the proverb from 1303 on. See Lean, III, 385.

EDWARD II

P. 77 (I, i, 142-143). "*K. Edw.* Why shouldst thou kneel? knowest thou not who I am? *Thy friend, thyself, another Gaveston!*" This alludes to the Latin proverb, "*Amicus alter ipse.*" Shakespeare, in addition to his allusion to this proverb in *Hamlet* (I, ii, 161), employs it in *Richard III* (II, ii, 151-152): "My other self, my counsel's consistory, My oracle, my prophet!" In addition to the examples cited in *E. P. L.* (p. 164), it is

found in *The Spanish Tragedy*, II, iv, 9; *The First Part of Jeronimo* (Hazlitt's *Dodsley*, IV, 354); *The Taming of a Shrew*, I, i, 8; *Wily Beguiled* (Hazlitt's *Dodsley*, IX, 248, and IX, 281); and *Fuimus Troes* (Hazlitt's *Dodsley*, XII, 530). Apperson does not record the proverb.

P. 99 (I, iv, 284). "*Mor. jun.* But cannot brook a night-grown mushroom." The proverb, "In one night grows a mushroom," referring to an upstart, is included in several sixteenth- and seventeenth-century collections. See *E. P. L.*, p. 233. This proverb is not in Apperson.

P. 105 (I, iv, 406). "*Mor. jun.* He wears a lord's revenue on his back." John Clarke, in his *Paroemiologia Anglo-Latina* (1639), p. 262, has the proverb, "He wears a whole Lordship on his back." As noted in the Case edition, the thought occurs twice in Shakespeare.

P. 124 (II, ii, 201-202). "*K. Edw.* Yet, shall the crowing of these cockerels Affright a lion?" The lion's fear of the cock goes back to Pliny, *Natural History* (bk. VIII, ch. 16, and bk. X, ch. 21, ed. Holland) and Plutarch, *Morals* (II, 96, ed. W. W. Godwin). The same idea is repeated by Bartholomew Anglicus and Thomas Lupton (H. W. Seager, *Natural History in Shakespeare's Time*, pp. 66, 184, 185). Erasmus assisted in popularizing the belief in England through his *Similia*: "Leo cunctis formidatum animal, cantum ac cristam galli formidat" (p. 611B, ed. 1703). The thought is found in Chapman, *Bussy D'Ambois*, I, ii, 168-169; Dekker, *Match Me in London* (ed. John Pearson, IV, 178); Wilson, *Belphegor* (see Lean, III, 393); Dekker, *The Raven's Almanacke* (Huth Library Series, IV, 172); Melbancke, *Philotimus* (p. 31, ed. 1583); and Scott, *Discovery of Witchcraft* (p. 70, ed. 1654). The seventeenth century, skeptical of the belief, has recorded the fact that the lion is not frightened by the cock. See Lodge, *A Learned Summary upon the Famous Poems of William of Saluste Lord of Bargas*, p. 243; Sir Thomas Browne, *Pseudodoxia Epidemica* (III, xxvii, 7); and Emma Phipson, *The Animal-Lore of Shakespeare's Time*, p. 225. Because of increasing skepticism this one time "old truth" did not find its way into collections of English proverbs.

P. 143 (III, ii, 79-80). "*Q. Isab.* Ah, boy! this towardness makes thy mother fear Thou art not mark'd to many days on earth." This is an allusion to the proverb, "The good die young." See Apperson, p. 254; Lean, IV, 166; Jente, p. 441; and *E. P. L.*, p. 170.

P. 151 (III, iii, 58-59). "*Lan.* The worst is death, and better die to live Than live in infamy under such a king." Professor Briggs, as cited in the Case ed., has noted the classical origin of this thought. See the quotation from *Doctor Faustus* (IV, iv, 26), for comment on this proverb.

P. 170 (IV, vi, 8). "*K. Edw.* Father, thy face should harbour no deceit." This is an allusion to the belief in Elizabeth's day that a man's heart could be read in his face. This belief gave rise to the proverb, "The face is index to the heart," a thought which is found repeatedly in Shakespeare. See Apperson, p. 198.

P. 174 (IV, vi, 94). "*K. Edw.* Well, that shall be, shall be." See the note in this article on *Doctor Faustus* (I, i, 48-49), for comment on this proverb.

Pp. 185-186 (II, v, 83-85). "War. is it not enough That we have taken him, but must we now Leave him on '*had I wist*,' and let him go?" The proverb alluded to in the words printed in italics is "Beware of had I wist." See Apperson, p. 277; *E. P. L.*, p. 77; and Lean, II, 719.

HERO AND LEANDER

P. 39 (I, 209-211). "This sacrifice (whose sweet perfume descending From Venus' altar to your footsteps bending) Doth testify that you exceed her far." These lines are based on the proverb, "Smoke follows the fairest." See Apperson, p. 581; and Lean, II, 608. Sir Thomas Browne, *Pseudodoxia Epidemica* (v, xxii, 8), says: "That smoak doth follow the fairest, is . . . the continuation of a very ancient opinion, as Petrus Victorius and Casaubon have observed from a passage in Athenaeus."

P. 40 (I, 231). "Vessels of brass oft handled, brightly shine." Professor Martin (*Hero and Leander*, Case ed.) has pointed out the source of this passage in Ovid, *Elegia*, I, viii, 51. Erasmus employs the proverb in his *Similia* (p. 563F, ed. 1703) in the form "ferrum, aut aes usu splendescit." In *Euphues*, Lyly has, "Iron the more it is used the brighter it is." See *E. P. L.*, p. 196. Further instances of the proverb are found in Constable's *Diana*, Sonnet x (*Elizabethan Sonnets in An English Garner*, ed. Sidney Lee, II, 95): "Iron with wearing shines"; and in Dekker, *Westward Ho*, iv, ii (*The Works of John Webster*, ed. Dyce, p. 233), "Beauty, like gold, being us'd becomes more bright."

P. 41 (I, 255). "One is no number." The proverb does not occur in this form in the older collections of English proverbs, but Apperson (p. 472) cites instances of its occurrence in literature from 1539 on. Further examples are found in Lyly, *Midas*, III, i, 31-33 (ed. Bond, III, 130); Shakespeare, *Sonnet 136*, l. 8; Drummond, *Kisses Desired* (note to Shakespeare, *Sonnet 8*, l. 14, Eng. Ard. ed.); and Dekker, *II Honest Whore*, iv, i, 349-351 (ed. W. A. Neilson, in *C. E. D.*).

P. 44 (I, 299-302). "The rites In which love's beauteous empress most delights, Are banquets, Doric music, mid-night revel, Plays, masques, and all that stern age counteth evil." This quotation is strikingly similar to passages in Lyly,¹² Spenser,¹³ Shakespeare,¹⁴ and Marston.¹⁵ The similarity

¹² Venus. Ile haue her wittie, quick, and amorous,
Delight in reuels and in banqueting,
Wanton discourses, musicke, and merry songes.

The Woman in the Moon, III, ii, 1-4.

¹³ [Venus]. So my delight is all in ioyfulnessse,
In beds, in bowres, in banckets, and in feasts:

Faerie Queene, III, vi, 22.

¹⁴ *Berowne*. For revels, dances, masks, and merry hours,
Forerun fair Love, strewing her way with flowers.

Love's Labour's Lost, IV, iii, 376-7.

¹⁵ Loves only empress

Whose kingdom rests in wanton revelling.

Pygmalion, II. 134-5.

of these four passages is to be accounted for rather by independent re-workings of a common source than by the borrowing of one poet from another. Apperson does not record the thought as proverbial. Erasmus assisted in giving this classic thought currency in England. In his *Similia* (p. 587F, ed. 1703), with Plutarch noted as his source, he has: "Amor levatur cantu, corollis, osculis." Marlowe's mention of the "stern age" that "counteth evil" the "rites in which love's beauteous empress most delights" has reference to such views on the subject as are expressed by Vives in his *Eruditio mulieris christianae* (bk. I, ch. 14), and quoted by Northbrooke in *A Treatise against Dicing, Dancing, Plays, and Interludes* (Shakespeare Society ed., p. 166): "Ludouicus Vives, a learned man, sayth: Loue is bred by reason of company, and communication with men; for among pleasures, feasting, laughing, dauncing, and voluptuousnesse, is the kingdom of Venus and Cupid: and with these things folkes myndes be entised and snared, and especially the women, on whome pleasure hath sorest dominion."

P. 54 (II, 51). "Like Aesop's cock, this jewel he enjoyed, And as a brother with his sister toyed." Similar allusions to the cock that preferred a barley-corn to a jewel were fairly common in Elizabethan times. See *E. P. L.*, p. 68. Further instances of the proverb are found in *How a Man May Choose a Good Wife from a Bad*, III, iii (Hazlitt's *Dodsley*, IX, 62); and *The Muse's Looking Glass*, II, iv, and III, ii (ed. Hazlitt, I, 213 and 224). This thought does not seem to have been included in English collections of proverbs until the time of Fuller (1732), who has it in the form, "A barley-corn is better than a diamond to a cock." It is not cited by Apperson.

M. P. TILLEY and JAMES K. RAY

University of Michigan

SYMMETRY IN MILTON'S *SAMSON AGONISTES*

It is characteristic of the Greek tragedians that symmetry should not be confined to the general conception of a play. Aeschylus, Sophocles, and Euripides were fellow-countrymen, perhaps contemporaries, of Phidias and Ictinus. And the Attic passion for beauty was expressed in the smallest details of any work of art. Thus, structural symmetry, in the great dramas, may be found through every portion of the work, revealing itself in a constant balancing of part against part, and a formal correspondence of speech with speech, to which there is no parallel in any production of the modern stage.¹

This particular debt of *Samson Agonistes* to Greek drama has

¹ A. E. Haigh, *The Tragic Drama of the Greeks*, p. 378.

never been adequately investigated. But once we consider the matter, we find that here, as in so many other respects, Milton has successfully followed his best Greek models. He could scarcely have achieved more symmetry in his plot if he had planned it mathematically. It falls into five distinct parts, each an artistic whole, and all of very nearly the same length:²

- 1) Samson alone and with the Chorus: 1-325.
- 2) Samson and Manoa: 326-709.
- 3) Samson and Dalila: 710-1060.
- 4) Samson with the two instruments of force: 1061-1440.
- 5) Samson at the feast: 1441-1758.

It is also worth noticing that the first and last *epeisodia* are the shortest, being within ten lines of the same length;³ and the *kommos*, upon which the play ends, is very nearly the length of the *prologos*.⁴ If these points seem far-fetched, let it be recalled that

the artistic sense of the Greeks prevented them from pushing this principle to extremes, or from effacing the beauty and spontaneity of their drama by mathematical regularity of form. . . . Their occasional observance, without forcing itself unduly upon the attention, merely serves to impress the mind with a general sense of harmony and proportion.⁵

Milton, to be sure, has chosen to ignore the most obvious manifestation of this principle, the antistrophic arrangement of the choral odes. But when we look closely at the dialogue, or even at the choral odes themselves, we find that he has understood and subtly applied a typical attribute of Greek tragedy. How conscious the application was, we can only guess. Much of what we shall examine as evidence may be either pure coincidence or unconscious art. But the effect is there—and the effect is interesting.

The *prologos* of *Samson Agonistes* falls logically into five parts: eleven lines addressed to the guide; eleven lines explaining the occasion (12-22); forty-three and a half lines of lament for the past (23-66); an exactly equal number devoted to his present blindness (66-109); and five lines upon the approach of the

² If *S. A.* were divided into five equal parts, each would consist of 352 lines. As it happens, no one of the five parts here outlined misses this number by more than 34 lines. The Dalila episode comes within a single line of conforming exactly.

³ *S. A.* 176-292, 1300-1426.

⁴ *Ib.*, 1-114, 1660-1758.

⁵ Haigh, *op. cit.*, p. 384.

Chorus (110-114). The *parodos* does not admit of quite so striking a division. The first nine and a half lines are devoted to recognition and description (115-124). But then follow twenty-six and a half lines in which Samson's past glory is recalled (124-150), and twenty-five lines of lamentation (151-175). In the first *epeisodion*, however, there is only one noticeable instance of balance: the first two speeches of the Chorus are of exactly nine lines each (178-186, 210-218). The first *stasimon* is divided into five stanzas: three of these are seven lines long; one is eight, which is close enough; and the last is four. This last stanza, which might seem to destroy the symmetry, is exactly complemented by the following four lines announcing the arrival of Manoa (322-325, 326-329),⁶ and the two stanzas together make another unit of eight lines.

In the second *epeisodion* there is much balancing of speeches. The two lines spoken by Samson on hearing of his father's approach (330-331) are matched by the two of the Chorus showing Samson to Manoa (338-339). When Manoa in fifteen lines tells how he is arranging for ransom (472-486), Samson protests in a speech of fifteen lines (487-501). The two speeches which immediately follow are nineteen and twenty lines, respectively (502-520, 521-540). Then the Chorus sings of temperance in six lines (541-546), Samson replies in six lines (547-552), and the Chorus adds a final word in five lines (553-557). The other speeches of this *epeisodion* exhibit no striking symmetry; Samson's and Manoa's final exchange are nine and seven lines respectively (590-598, 599-605). The second *stasimon*, however, is extremely interesting. It is divided into four sections. The second and third stanzas, of twenty and eighteen lines respectively (667-686, 687-704), consist of general philosophizing. The fourth stanza, a five-line prayer for Samson, seems to stand alone.⁷ The first stanza, of fifteen lines (652-666), is exactly complemented by the fifteen-line speech announcing the arrival of Dalila (710-724)—almost a continuation of the ode.

In the third *epeisodion*, Dalila's first speech, of sixteen lines (732-747), is balanced by Samson's response of eighteen lines

⁶ This structural symmetry in the choral odes is not inconsistent with Milton's statements in his preface. He explains that since the odes are not to be sung, he has not attempted to make them *metrically* alike. He says nothing about the length of his stanzas.

⁷ However, see S. A. 726-731. This would give the interesting pattern: ABBAC.

(748-765). The next four speeches are of dissimilar length; but when Dalila rebukes Samson in two lines, his sarcastic reply is of exactly the same length (903-906). Dalila's final plea of twenty-one lines (907-927) is almost matched by Samson's refusal, which is two lines longer (928-950). These instances of symmetry are the more remarkable in this scene because Milton chivalrously allows Dalila about fifty more lines than he gives his hero. After Dalila's departure, we find an interesting 'pattern' furnished by the protagonist and the Chorus: the last four speeches consisting of two, four, five, and two lines respectively (997-1009). The third *stasimon* is made up of five stanzas (1010-1060). The first and last are eight lines long; the second is as long as their sum; and the fourth is seven—near enough to give the effect of balance. The middle stanza is twelve lines long—half-way between eight and sixteen.

The only perfect instance of balance in the actual dialogue between Samson and Harapha is the two-line challenge with its correspondingly brief reply (1104-1107). There is at least one example, however, of a pair of speeches which differ in length by only two lines (1156-1167, 1168-1177). Immediately after Harapha's departure there are two speeches by the Chorus and one by Samson, each of three lines (1244-1252). The fourth *stasimon* also displays a certain symmetry: the first stanza is of nineteen lines (1268-1286); the second, of ten—or almost half (1287-1296). The first stanza, incidentally, consists of only two sentences, which suggest a further division into parts of nine and ten lines respectively. The subsequent speech of the Chorus, eleven lines announcing the arrival of the Public Officer, completes the pattern.

In the fifth *epeisodion* the Officer has a speech of one line; Samson, one of ten; the Officer, another one; and Samson, a nine (1322-1342). Samson's final speech of the play, one of fourteen lines, is exactly balanced by the fifth *stasimon* (1413-1426, 1427-1440). In the final dialogue between Manoa and the Chorus, there are three successive speeches of two lines each (1515-1520). The *kommos* also has the symmetry which by now we should expect. The first outburst of the Chorus (1660-1668) is exactly half as long as the first semi-chorus (1669-1686). The second semi-chorus, as it happens, is three lines longer than the first; but the effect of symmetry is there. Manoa's last speech is only two lines

shorter than both semi-choruses combined. The final chorus, appropriately, stands alone.

A. W. Verity has rightly called attention to the comparative absence, in *Samson Agonistes*, of *στιχομυθία*, or conversation in alternate lines. This raises, however, a difficult point, which he does not attempt to deal with.⁸ Milton must have been aware of the popularity of this device with the Greek tragedians; it is, moreover, another instance of their love of balance in dialogue. Euripides used it to the greatest extreme; in the *Ion* it monopolizes about one-fourth of the play.⁹ The *Agamemnon* has less than any of the other extant tragedies, but both the *Prometheus* and the *Choephoroi* of Aeschylus have about twice as much as the *Agamemnon*. In the *Oedipus Coloneus*, which *Samson Agonistes* so closely resembles in many respects, there is more *stichomythia* than in any of the other plays of Sophocles, and more than three times as much as in the *Agamemnon*. But the latter play, which is the only conceivable one to which Milton might have looked for precedent in this matter, has, in turn, at least three times as much as the *Samson*. In the English play there are only seven instances of this device, and no more than four single lines ever occur together.¹⁰ As a matter of fact, there are only thirty-one single-line speeches in the entire play, and these include those speeches of Manoa and the Messenger which are really fractions of a line. It might be argued that the effect of *stichomythia* is given by combinations of two-line speeches¹¹ or by the combination of one-line with two- or three-line speeches.¹² But if we were to count all of these, it would no more than double the number of instances—and the *Samson* would still be deficient compared with any tragedy of the Greeks.

There are several possible reasons for the absence of *sticho-*

⁸ Verity's edition of *S. A.*, p. xlvii n. But compare J. H. Hanford, who finds Milton's use of *stichomythia* 'reminiscent of the ancients' (*Handbook*, 1933 ed., p. 255). John Bailey makes the same generalization, *Milton*, p. 242.

⁹ See also the *Hel.*, *Orest.*, and *Iph. Taur.*

¹⁰ *S. A.* 1061-1064, 1074-1075, 1308-1309, 1345-1347, 1562-1563, 1569-1570, 1582-1584.

¹¹ For example, *ib.*, 903-906, 1104-1107, 1515-1520.

¹² For example, *ib.*, 1178-1181, 1233-1236, 1319-1322, 1363-1368, 1531-1536, 1552-1564.

mythia in Milton's play. He introduces it, as the Greeks do, when there is considerable tension; but on the whole, there is perhaps not enough emotional excitement in *Samson Agonistes* to allow of much of it. This, however, is only a partial answer; Euripides would have filled both the Harapha and Dalila scenes with 'thrust and parry in bright monostich.' Milton may conceivably have felt that large sections of this device mar rather than augment the symmetry of the piece; but more probably the true reason for his decision is to be found in a statement from his preface: having occasion to speak of the stage, he adds, significantly, 'to which this work never was intended.' *Stichomythia* is obviously a stage device: it delights both actors and audiences. In *Comus*, which Milton wrote for acting purposes, there is one instance fourteen lines long; nothing in the *Samson* can compare with this.¹³ In his preface Milton carefully explains that he has ignored strophe, antistrophe, and epode because his choruses are not to be sung; he has also omitted division into act and scene, these being likewise for stage production. Naturally he would not mention *stichomythia* in this connection—it is too trivial a detail. But I suggest that its omission from the play may be similarly accounted for.

WILLIAM R. PARKER

Oriel College, Oxford

AUTHOR'S CHANGES IN DRYDEN'S *CONQUEST OF GRANADA*, PART I

The question of Dryden's relation to the various editions of his plays which appeared in successive quartos during his lifetime has long challenged critical attention. As early as 1800, Edmond Malone, in the extensive "Account of the Life and Writings of John Dryden" which prefaces his edition of Dryden's *Prose Works*, reached this general conclusion: "When Dryden issued his several works from the press, he in general seems to have dismissed them from his thoughts, and to have been little solicitous about

¹³ *Comus*, 277-290. In the whole masque, however, there are only three instances of the device, probably because Milton was more interested in the lyrical element. And almost every Greek tragedy has a passage of *stichomythia* longer than the one in *Comus*.

rendering them more perfect." He noted, however, "several exceptions" to Dryden's "general negligence" in matters of revision. In considering Dryden's plays, he observed that "the second edition of his *Tyrannick Love* is said in the title-page to have been reviewed by the author." He further cited the preface to the second edition of *The Indian Emperor* as proof of some heed on Dryden's part to minor betterments of text, notwithstanding the author's confessed lack of leisure to amend "the more material faults of writing." On the main question of Dryden's "general negligence" in regard to revision of plays already published, Malone's conclusion seems substantially sound. To the "several exceptions" which may be said to prove Dryden's general rule, as interpreted by Malone, may be added a case of especial interest since it reveals alterations in Dryden's chief heroic drama, *The Conquest of Granada*.

The present study is based on collation of Yale Library copies of the five quartos of *The Conquest of Granada, Part I*, which appeared in Dryden's lifetime—1672 (Q1), 1673 (Q2), 1678 (Q3), 1687 (Q4), 1695 (Q5). The dominant authority of Q1 and the main relations to it of the successive quartos were firmly established in the valuable critical edition of *Selected Dramas of John Dryden* (1910), by Professor George R. Noyes. His general method of collating Dryden's texts was first to collate the considerably modernized Scott-Saintsbury edition "with the first edition of each play, and next with the Folio [published in 1701, the year after Dryden's death, and based on the inferior Q5], and a record was made of all variants. Then these variants were compared with the readings of the quartos (in which form Dryden's separate plays were always printed) intermediate between the first quarto and the Folio." In the case of *The Conquest of Granada, Part I*, this process led to the sound generalization that in Q2 "Dryden seems to have made some trifling changes, which disappeared in the later quartos." To Professor Noyes, "it did not seem worth while, however, to collate each line of the second quarto, in order to present a complete list of such changes." Nevertheless, full collation of Q2 with Q1 proves distinctly rewarding not merely in defining precisely the extent and character of these early "trifling changes" of text, but in providing a firmer basis for study of later textual history.

At the outset, it may be well to differentiate the so-called "author's changes" in Q2 from mere printer's corrections. Q1 shows some signs of hasty or careless printing in faulty pagination, in verbal misprints in the main text, and in the belated inclusion, after the Epilogue, of a song marked, "*Misplac'd. Sung at the dance, or Zambra in the third Act.*" Q2 transfers the misplaced song to its proper context and corrects some, though not all, of the misprints. In marked distinction from such merely mechanical corrections of details, four passages of the main text of Act V are revealed, through full collation of the quartos, as of outstanding significance. In all four cases, Q2 makes alterations that seem clearly beyond the province of the printer. If not, in the strictest sense of the term, author's changes, they suggest at least the sanction of authority above that of the compositor. These four passages will be considered first separately, then collectively.

- (1) Q1 *Benz.* No, *Ozmyn*, no, it is much less ill
To leave me than dispute a Fathers will:
(V, 2, 67-68)

Q2 *Benz.* No, *Ozmyn*, no; 'tis not so great an ill
To leave me, as dispute a Fathers Will:

The emendation of Q2 is evidently intended to remedy the metrical defect in the first line of Q1.

- (2) Q1 And, bending to the blast, all pale and dead,
Hears from within, the wind sing round its head:
(V, 3, 131-132)

Q2 Bends to the blast, all pale, and almost dead
While the loud Wind sings round its drooping Head.

The emendation of Q2 is clearly an authorized revision of the entire couplet.

- (3) Q1 When all my joys are gone
What cause can I for living longer, give,
But a dull lazy habitude to live? (V, 3, 245-247)

Q2 eliminates the first short unrhymed line. This seems an intentional change rather than a compositor's error in dropping a line accidentally.

- (4) Q1 *Almah.* It was your fault that fire seiz'd all your brest,
You should have blown up some, to save the rest.
But tis, at worst, but so consum'd by fire
As Cities are, that by their falls rise high'r.
(V, 3, 269-272)

Q2 *Alma.* Your Heart's, at worst, but so consum'd by fire
As Cities are, that by their falls rise high'r.

The emendation of Q2 is obviously designed to eliminate the opening couplet of Q1, for the consequent alteration of the following line shows that the couplet itself was not dropped accidentally by the compositor.

The subsequent history of these four passages in the later quartos and in the Folio of 1701 is remarkably consistent and enlightening. In all four cases Q3 follows Q2, but Q4 reverts to the original readings of Q1, and is in turn followed by Q5 and F. Thus these four author's changes—definite textual emendations, at any rate, authorized by some one other than the mere printer—are found only in Q2 and Q3, and disappear not merely from the later quartos but from the Folio. The method of partial collation in the Noyes edition showed textual variants in two of the four passages (the first and the last), but the other passages remain equally unnoted by Noyes and by Montague Summers in his recent critical edition of Dryden's *Dramatic Works*. Taken together, these four passages become doubly significant, for they establish Q2 as the only quarto which makes independent, even if slender, contribution to real revision of the original text, and they support conclusively inferences hitherto largely drawn from minor textual variants as to the interrelations of the successive quartos.

In default of explicit documentary evidence, it is perhaps only a reasonable assumption that Dryden personally inaugurated or explicitly sanctioned the four considerable textual revisions introduced in Q2 and retained in Q3. It is significant, however, that, of these four so-called "author's changes," the two which Noyes detected are, in his judgment, "certainly due to Dryden." A specific note (p. 438) on one of these passages runs thus: "Dryden seems to have been impressed by the absurdity of this couplet and to have canceled it in the second edition. It was restored in the third [*sic*] edition, whether by his wish or not it is hard to say." The restoration occurred in Q4, not in Q3, but if error as to the fact misled Noyes in this latter particular, it remains clear that he ascribed to Dryden the alteration made in Q2. Chance or convenience may have determined the ultimate reversion in Q4 to the text of Q1, instead of reprinting from Q3. Whether accidental or not, that reversion to the original text silently eliminated all four of the so-called "author's changes." If Dryden had been disturbed by their disappearance, he might have insisted on their

restoration in Q5, published five years before his death. But there is no evidence of such concern on his part, for Q5 resumes the easy practice of reprinting from the latest previous text. It is, however, needless to carry over bodily into the realm of mere conjecture facts that remain amply significant in the field of actual history. In any event, the so-called "author's changes" in Q2 prove that the history of the successive quartos of *The Conquest of Granada, Part I*, is more than a record of casual reprints of a popular play. The hand of a higher authority than the compositor is shown in the definite textual revisions that appear in Q2. The discovery of fuller internal evidence brings into clearer view facts somewhat obscured because they appear and disappear within the range of the lesser quartos that intervene between Dryden's original text and the first collected edition of his plays.

Yale University

GEORGE H. NETTLETON

DRYDEN'S LETTER OF ATTORNEY

In 1677, when John Dryden received an addition of £100 a year to his pension of £200, the payments on both pensions began to be irregular and portional, so that the poet's income actually decreased. Finding it expedient to commission George Ward¹ to collect his money and perhaps feeling that Ward would be a more importunate and successful solicitor than he had been,² Dryden

¹ George Ward is probably the Mr. Ward whose name appears in the *Caveat Book and Out Letters (General)* in connection with money due his Majesty, grants, and the collection of various rents. — *Calendar of Treasury Books, 1679-80. Preserved in the Public Record Office*, ed. Wm. A. Shaw, Vol. VI (London, 1913), pp. 31, 110, 298, 412-13. He may also be the George Ward, spoken of on March 7th, 1677 (N. S.), however, as *late* of the parish of St. Martins-in-the-Fields, who "assaulted a certain Ulick Mack-Elligott, and . . . then and there slew and murdered the said Ulick Mack-Elligott, by giving him with a rapier a mortal wound in the right part of his belly, of which wound the said Ulick Mack-Elligott then and there instantly died. . . . Acquitted of murder, but found 'Guilty' of manslaughter, George Ward pleaded his clergy effectually: 'cre' resp' usq' p'x' [crematio respectuatur usque proximam Gaolae Deliberacionem] the branding was deferred till the next Gaol Delivery." The assault took place on February 14th, see *Middlesex County Records*, ed. J. C. Jeaffreson (London, 1886-92), IV, 76.

² See *The Vindication of the Duke of Guise* (1684) in *The Works of John Dryden*, ed. Walter Scott (London, 1808), VII, 163: "If I am a

drew up a power of attorney on December 14th, 1680. The sub-joined document, which is endorsed "Mr. Drydens Letter of Attorney to Mr. Ward 14th: xber 1680," is now in the Watson Autograph Collection (no. 583), National Library of Scotland.

Know all men by these presents that I John Dryden of the parish of St Martin in the feilds in the County of Middx^s Esqr. have made ordeyned constituted and appoynted and in my stead and place putt George Ward of the same Parish and County Gentlⁿ my true and lawfull Attorney for mee and in my name and to my use to aske require and receive of the officers and Tellers of his Majtyes Receipt of Excheqr all and every such sume and sumes of money as from tyme to tyme or att any tyme hereafter shall be due or payable to mee by vertue of his Majtyes Letters Patents and Privy Seale Granting to me the severall Pensons or Anuities of twoe hundred pounds and one hundred pounds yearly out of the said Receipt of Excheqr and the receipt acquittante or acquittances of the said George Ward either in my name or his owne shall be from tyme to tyme a sufficient warrt and discharge to such officer or Teller soe paying the same or any parte thereof by vertue hereof. Given under my hand and seale this foureteenth day of December Anno R Rs Caroli Sedi xxxijo Annoque dni 1680⁴

Sealed and delivered

in presence of

John Dryden

Margrat Rigby

the marke of

Barbara X^s Humphres

John Bland

COLEMAN O. PARSONS

American University

mercenary scribbler, the lords commissioners of the treasury best know: I am sure, they have found me no importunate solicitor; for I know myself, I deserved little, and, therefore, have never desired much." It is likely that Dryden gave Ward power of attorney because of an intention to absent himself from London.

³ Scott refers to Dryden as living in Gerrard Street about this time, but that street was not built until 1681. Although Mr. George H. Cunningham states that Dryden was living on the south side of Fleet Street (p. 238) and also at no. 137, Long Acre (p. 427), in 1680, the latter assertion is obviously the correct one.—Cunningham, *London* (London, 1927); see W. H. Davenport Adams, *A Book about London* (London, 1890), pp. 113, 149, for a similar contradiction.

⁴ Two days after this date, on December 16th, 1680, the sum of £50 was issued to John Dryden. For a discussion of Dryden's pensions, see E. K. Broadus, *The Laureateship* (Oxford, 1921), pp. 59-74, and the more detailed and accurate treatment by C. E. Ward, "A Biographical Note on John Dryden," *MLR.*, xxvii (1932), 206-210, and L. I. Bredvold, "Notes on John Dryden's Pension," *MP.*, xxx (1933), 267-74.

⁵ The X represents Barbara's mark.

restoration in Q5, published five years before his death. But there is no evidence of such concern on his part, for Q5 resumes the easy practice of reprinting from the latest previous text. It is, however, needless to carry over bodily into the realm of mere conjecture facts that remain amply significant in the field of actual history. In any event, the so-called "author's changes" in Q2 prove that the history of the successive quartos of *The Conquest of Granada, Part I*, is more than a record of casual reprints of a popular play. The hand of a higher authority than the compositor is shown in the definite textual revisions that appear in Q2. The discovery of fuller internal evidence brings into clearer view facts somewhat obscured because they appear and disappear within the range of the lesser quartos that intervene between Dryden's original text and the first collected edition of his plays.

Yale University

GEORGE H. NETTLETON

DRYDEN'S LETTER OF ATTORNEY

In 1677, when John Dryden received an addition of £100 a year to his pension of £200, the payments on both pensions began to be irregular and portioned, so that the poet's income actually decreased. Finding it expedient to commission George Ward¹ to collect his money and perhaps feeling that Ward would be a more importunate and successful solicitor than he had been,² Dryden

¹ George Ward is probably the Mr. Ward whose name appears in the *Caveat Book* and *Out Letters (General)* in connection with money due his Majesty, grants, and the collection of various rents. — *Calendar of Treasury Books, 1679-80. Preserved in the Public Record Office*, ed. Wm. A. Shaw, Vol. vi (London, 1913), pp. 31, 110, 298, 412-13. He may also be the George Ward, spoken of on March 7th, 1677 (N. S.), however, as late of the parish of St. Martins-in-the-Fields, who "assaulted a certain Ulick Mack-Elligott, and . . . then and there slew and murdered the said Ulick Mack-Elligott, by giving him with a rapier a mortal wound in the right part of his belly, of which wound the said Ulick Mack-Elligott then and there instantly died. . . . Acquitted of murder, but found 'Guilty' of manslaughter, George Ward pleaded his clergy effectually: 'cre' resp' usq' p'x' [crematio respectuatur usque proximam Gaolae Deliberacionem] the branding was deferred till the next Gaol Delivery." The assault took place on February 14th, see *Middlesex County Records*, ed. J. C. Jeaffreson (London, 1886-92), iv, 76.

² See *The Vindication of the Duke of Guise* (1684) in *The Works of John Dryden*, ed. Walter Scott (London, 1808), vii, 163: "If I am a

drew up a power of attorney on December 14th, 1680. The sub-joined document, which is endorsed "Mr. Drydens Letter of Attorney to Mr. Ward 14th: xber 1680," is now in the Watson Autograph Collection (no. 583), National Library of Scotland.

Know all men by these presents that I John Dryden of the parish of St Martin in the feilds in the County of Middx^s Esqr. have made ordeyned constituted and appoynted and in my stead and place putt George Ward of the same Parish and County Gentlⁿ my true and lawfull Attorney for mee and in my name and to my use to aske require and receive of the officers and Tellers of his Majtyes Receipt of Excheqr all and every such sume and sumes of money as from tyme to tyme or att any tyme hereafter shall be due or payable to mee by vertue of his Majtyes Letters Patents and Privy Seale Granting to me the severall Pensons or Anuities of twoe hundred pounds and one hundred pounds yearly out of the said Receipt of Excheqr and the receipt acquittante or acquittances of the said George Ward either in my name or his owne shall be from tyme to tyme a sufficient warrt and discharge to such officer or Teller soe paying the same or any parte thereof by vertue hereof. Given under my hand and seale this foureteenth day of December Anno R Rs Caroli Sedi xxxijo Annoque dni 1680⁴

Sealed and delivered

in presence of

John Dryden

Margrat Rigby

the marke of

Barbara X^s Humphres

John Bland

COLEMAN O. PARSONS

American University

mercenary scribbler, the lords commissioners of the treasury best know: I am sure, they have found me no importunate solicitor; for I know myself, I deserved little, and, therefore, have never desired much." It is likely that Dryden gave Ward power of attorney because of an intention to absent himself from London.

³ Scott refers to Dryden as living in Gerrard Street about this time, but that street was not built until 1681. Although Mr. George H. Cunningham states that Dryden was living on the south side of Fleet Street (p. 238) and also at no. 137, Long Acre (p. 427), in 1680, the latter assertion is obviously the correct one.—Cunningham, *London* (London, 1927); see W. H. Davenport Adams, *A Book about London* (London, 1890), pp. 113, 149, for a similar contradiction.

⁴ Two days after this date, on December 16th, 1680, the sum of £50 was issued to John Dryden. For a discussion of Dryden's pensions, see E. K. Broadus, *The Laureateship* (Oxford, 1921), pp. 59-74, and the more detailed and accurate treatment by C. E. Ward, "A Biographical Note on John Dryden," *MLR.*, xxvii (1932), 206-210, and L. I. Bredvold, "Notes on John Dryden's Pension," *MP.*, xxx (1933), 267-74.

⁵ The X represents Barbara's mark.

A DRYDEN ANECDOTE

In Defoe's *Review* for May 17, 1712 (VIII, no. 180), there appears the following story:

. . . meer calling Names, meer Railing, calling Fool, Beggar, Knave, that is, in *English*, *Rogue*, and *Rascal*; this was never suffer'd in any Age: I remember the Case of Mr. *Dryden*, the Author of *Absalom* and *Achitophel*; Mr. *Dryden* had describ'd the Duke of *Buckingham* with a great deal of Wit, but in one Line had given him ill Names, as *Fiddler* and *Buffoon*; the Duke was a Lover of Wit, and had as much himself as most Men of the Age, but resolved to take some Advantage of the Author's Weakness in that part; to which purpose, his Grace finds him at a *Coffee-House*, and charging him with want of Decency, as no true part of *Satyr*, Can'd him very smartly; *there, Sir*, said the Duke, *is for your ill Manners*; and *here, Sir*, says he, *is for your Wit*, and threw him a Purse with Thirty Guineas at the same Time. Now I would recommend to all those Gentlemen who take upon them to write Satyrs on Great Men, that they would take care to merit the *Guineas* without the *Cane*. . . .

Defoe was probably the first to print this story. In *The Quarterly Review* for January, 1898 (CLXXXVII, 101), an anonymous reviewer relates it "according to Lord Bathurst," probably Pope's Bathurst, Allen, the first Earl (1684-1775). Lady Winifred Burghclere in her biography, *George Villiers* (1903), tells it (p. 261), as does Mr. Robert P. Tristram Coffin in his book, *The Dukes of Buckingham* (1931, p. 328).

The anecdote can hardly be true; at any rate not in the exact way Defoe tells it. It may, of course, be nothing more than a variation on the "Black Will with a cudgel" episode, but if it is, it introduces elements into that story in a way rather difficult to explain. In *Athenae Oxonienses* Anthony à Wood, after quoting the portrait of Zimri, refers to the same anecdote Defoe tells:

Now whereas the generality of people think that Mr. Dryden was bastinado'd at Will's coffee-house in Covent-Garden for the said character, by the endeavours of the duke, is false . . . sure I am that the duke of Bucks did not cause him to be beaten. . . .¹

Except for this reference the anecdote seems to be unknown to Dryden biography.

EDWARD G. FLETCHER

The University of Texas

¹ Philip Bliss' edition, London, 1820, IV, column 210.

THE MODENA TROUPE IN ENGLAND

In his *Restoration Drama*, Professor Allardyce Nicoll traces four visits to England by troupes of Italian *commedia dell' arte* players. These occurred in 1673, 1675, 1678-79, and 1683, and in each case the troupe is identified as the one located in Paris from 1661 to 1697, including as its most famous actor Tiberio Fiorilli.¹ In a later work, however, Professor Nicoll alters his conclusion concerning the identification of the 1678-79 troupe:

It was in this year [1678] that the Duke of Modena was aiding in the arrangements for dispatching a company of Italian players to England. These were captained by Tiberio Fiorilli *Scaramuccia*, who had already been in London in 1673 and 1675, but included members of the Ducal troupe.²

It is my purpose in this paper to present additional information concerning the appearance of the Modena troupe in England, and to show that on this occasion Fiorilli was not a member of the company.

Professor Nicoll's identification of the Modena troupe is based upon information concerning Giovan Antonio Lolli and Antonio Riccoboni, members of the Modena troupe, to be found in Rasi's *I Comici Italiani*.³ A complete list of the players who visited England in 1678 exists, however, in a hitherto unpublished document in the Public Record Office.⁴ The "annexed list" of players contains thirty-six names. Twelve are those of actors of the times known to have been members of the Modena troupe. Of the remaining twenty-four, some represent wives and children of the actors, while others convey no hint of their relationship to the company. The known facts about the lives of the twelve actors are to be found in Rasi's work, by means of which the following troupe may be formed:

¹ Allardyce Nicoll, *A History of Restoration Drama*, pp. 238-239. The same identification is made by Eleanore Boswell, *The Restoration Court Stage*, pp. 118-125, and Montague Summers, *The Complete Works of William Wycherley*, I, 263.

² Allardyce Nicoll, *Masks Mimes and Miracles*, p. 339.

³ Luigi Rasi, *I Comici Italiani* (Florence, 1897-1905), III, 31-32, 347.

⁴ February 13, 1679. Pass for the band of Italian Players, now departing out of this realm, with annexed list of them sent by Lord Arlington. *Cal. State Papers, Dom. Ser.*, 1679-1680, p. 83.

Antonio Riccoboni	<i>Pantalone</i>
Giuseppe Tortoriti	<i>Pasquariello</i>
Giuseppe Antonio Fiala	<i>Capitano Sbranaleoni</i>
Marzia Fiala	<i>Flaminia (seconda donna)</i>
Giovan Antonio Lolli	<i>Dottor Brentino</i>
Francesco Angeli *	? (amoroso)
Gio. Andrea Cimadori	<i>Finocchio (zanni)</i>
Bernardo Narici	<i>Orazio (amoroso)</i>
Costantino Costantini	<i>Gradelino (zanni)</i>
Domenica Costantini	<i>Corallina (servetta)</i>
Giovanni Battista Costantini	<i>Cintio (amoroso)</i>
Teresa Corona Sabolini Costantini	<i>Diana (prima donna)</i>

The name of Tiberio Fiorilli does not appear, and to date no proof of his presence in England at this time has been produced.

Unlike the Paris troupe, which on its three appearances in England played during the summer months, the Modena troupe came in November.⁶ There is extant a letter written by Lolli from England in which it is revealed that the Italians were not happy at the court of Charles II.⁷ They remained three months, yet were able to present only six plays "con Pochissimo Applauso." Just why they were unsuccessful is not clear. The actors themselves were excellent, although there was dissension in their ranks as Lolli's letter indicates. The letter does, however, explain the presence of the Duke of Modena's company in England. Lolli praises "Sua Altezza Reale là Sig.^{ra} Duchessa di Iorch" as the benefactor of the troupe. This was Mary d'Este, daughter of Alfonso IV, Duke of Modena, and second wife of James, Duke of York. It was undoubtedly at Mary of Modena's instigation that the troupe of the Duke, at that time her brother, Francesco II, journeyed to England. And when the Italian players were unsuccessful, she aided them twice with money, and finally secured for them the "tanto desiderata licenza" to leave England. One of her letters to her brother, the Duke of Modena, furnishes a possible explanation for the Italians' failure in England: the ill-feeling and unrest at court caused by the charges of Titus Oates.⁸ The position of

* Probably Francesco Delli Angioli, known to have been a member of the Modena troupe in 1679 (See Rasi, *op. cit.*, I, 751-752).

⁶ *Cal. Treasury Books*, 1676-79, p. 1160.

⁷ Rasi, *op. cit.*, III, 31.

⁸ Martin Haile, *Queen Mary of Modena* (London, 1905), p. 79.

the Duchess, a Catholic, at the English court during a time of strong anti-Catholic sentiment was a difficult one, and the disfavor in which she was held may have extended to her Italian compatriots.

This first recorded visit of the troupe of the Duke of Modena to England seems also to have been the last. Tiberio Fiorilli, who cannot be connected with the Modena troupe, is thought to have made a final appearance at the court of Charles II in 1683, bringing with him the regular Paris troupe.⁹ On this point, however, there is no positive proof.

A. L. BADER

Ann Arbor, Michigan

LA MARQUISE DU BOURGEOIS GENTILHOMME

Je voudrais dans cet article réhabiliter une femme: la charmante Dorimène du *Bourgeois Gentilhomme*, qui a été si fort malmenée par les critiques. Il est même surprenant de constater avec quelle unanimité ils s'acharnent sur cette jeune veuve, et combien ce rôle si secondaire a attiré l'attention malveillante des commentateurs.

Il me sera nécessaire de faire un assez grand nombre de citations pour montrer l'étendue et le sérieux de l'attaque. Je commencerai par les plus furieuses et les plus étonnantes: Lafenestre dans son petit volume très modéré sur Molière dans la "Collection des Grands Ecrivains français" ira jusqu'à dire:

Mme de Sotenville et Mme d'Escarbagnas ne sont que des sottises ridicules, affolées de vanité nobiliaire, mais Angélique, née de Sotenville, et la marquise Dorimène qui *enjôle* M. Jourdain, comme son homonyme avait déjà épousé de force Sganarelle, ne sont que d'affreuses drôlesses, libertines et rapaces.¹

Ailleurs il dira: "D'autre part, la Noblesse, cultivée mais corrompue, avec ses insolences et ses vices, dans la *comtesse intrigante* et son *digne* amant, le comte escroc."² Dorimène est associée ici, comme elle le sera toujours, avec Dorante. J'abandonne Dorante aux critiques, mais je souligne le mot "*digne* amant," et je m'étonne moins de l'erreur sur le caractère de ma marquise quand

⁹ Nicoll, *A History of Restoration Drama*, p. 239, and Boswell, *op. cit.*, pp. 124-125.

¹ Georges Lafenestre: *Molière*, 1909, p. 129.

² *Ibid.*, p. 82.

je vois l'auteur parler d'*enjôler* M. Jourdain, et la marquise devenir une *comtesse*. C'est un désappointement pour moi de m'apercevoir que Lintilhac, si pondéré et si bon juge, n'est pas plus indulgent: "*Le couple d'aventuriers de haut vol* que forment le comte Dorante et la marquise Dorimène."³

Je passe à un second groupe de critiques qui sont moins sévères, et par là même plus dangereuses, parce que plus acceptables au premier abord. Je citerai par exemple Brisson:

Dorimène paraît étrangère à ces manèges; pourtant on ne peut guère concevoir qu'une aussi fine *commère* ne remarque pas dans ce qui se passe autour d'elle un je ne sais quoi d'équivoque et de suspect. De la *sucrée* et *sournoise* Dorimène, de l'effronté Dorante, naîtra l'innombrable lignée des fripons du grand monde, des *louches coquettes* qui pendant un siècle et demi pulluleront au théâtre.⁴

L'édition Despois-Mesnard résume et consacre . . . l'erreur:

Il n'est pas *tout-à-fait exact* de dire, comme quelques-uns l'ont fait, que dans la comédie de *Turcaret* les figures du chevalier, qui a fait ses caravanes au lansquenet, et de la coquette baronne, aient été dessinées d'après celles de Dorante et *Dorimène*, lesquelles ont pu suggérer seulement l'idée de ces personnages, très différents d'ailleurs. En apparence le plus hardi des deux auteurs comiques a été Lesage, qui a donné des couleurs beaucoup plus noires à la corruption de son chevalier et de sa baronne; mais à y bien regarder, c'est Molière qui a le plus osé, justement parce qu'au lieu d'être de vulgaires aventuriers, son comte est un vrai comte, sa *marquise* une vraie marquise, l'un et l'autre, sans qu'il reste de doute, gens du monde et gens de cour.⁵

Oui, la marquise est une "vraie marquise," mais elle n'est pas une "aventurière."

Mais dans ce concert d'accusations⁶ j'entends une autre note frappée par ceux qui ont lu la pièce avant d'en parler, et qui cherchent à être justes, mais qui n'osent pas aller contre l'opinion reçue, et dans leur embarras trouvent Dorimène "énigmatique." Je pense pour le moment à Rigal qui connaît son Molière, et qui,

³ Eugène Lintilhac: *Histoire du Théâtre en France*, 1908, III, 278.

⁴ Adolphe Brisson: *Le Théâtre*, 1912, VII, 233.

⁵ *Œuvres de Molière*, Edition: Les Grands Ecrivains de la France, 1883, VIII, 36.

⁶ Voir aussi: *Conférences faites aux matinées classiques du Théâtre National de l'Odéon*, 1894, I, 86, et Victor Fournel: *Les Contemporains de Molière*, 1866, II, 274.

après avoir dit: "Dorimène est le personnage le plus énigmatique de tout le Théâtre de Molière," ne la condamne pas moins un peu plus loin en ces mots: "Cependant, gardons-nous de calomnier même une Dorimène. Celle-ci n'est pas aussi délibérément une friponne que sa fille ou sa petite-fille, la Baronne de Lesage."⁷

Cette unanimité des critiques m'étonne sans m'ébranler, et je reste convaincu que la Marquise est irréprochable. Je voudrais pouvoir citer tout son rôle, qui n'est pas long, et faire ressortir toutes ses qualités d'honnêteté, de délicatesse, de finesse. Je me contenterai de ces quelques lignes qui exposent si clairement ses rapports avec Dorante:

Mais vous ne dites pas que je m'engage insensiblement chaque jour à recevoir de trop grands témoignages de votre passion. . . . Pour moi, je ne puis plus répondre de rien, et je crois qu'à la fin vous me ferez venir au mariage dont je me suis tant éloignée. . . . Enfin, j'en reviens toujours là. Les dépenses que je vous vois faire pour moi m'inquiètent par deux raisons: l'une, qu'elles m'engagent plus que je ne voudrais; et l'autre, que je suis sûre, sans vous déplaire, que vous ne les faites point que vous ne vous incommodiez, et je ne veux point cela.⁸

Est-ce là une "affreuse drôlesse, libertine et rapace, une intrigante, une louche coquette?" L'est-elle davantage quand elle s'étonne que le festin ait lieu chez Jourdain: "Je ne sais pas, Dorante; je fais encore ici une étrange démarche, de me laisser amener par vous dans une maison où je ne connais personne," ou quand elle sort avec dignité après l'arrivée inattendue de Mme Jourdain: "Que veut donc dire tout ceci? Allez! Dorante, vous vous moquez de m'exposer aux sottes visions de cette extravagante," ou quand elle se moque de M. Jourdain en grande dame qu'elle est, quand il s'excuse auprès d'elle de la conduite de sa femme: "Cela n'est rien; j'excuse en elle un pareil mouvement. Votre cœur lui doit être précieux; et il n'est pas étrange que la possession d'un homme comme vous puisse inspirer quelques alarmes." J'ai beau relire le rôle, je ne trouve rien, je l'avoue, qui justifie ces accusations, je ne trouve pas un mot, une intention, une nuance, qui puisse donner au juge le plus malveillant l'impression que le personnage de Molière est autre qu'une femme qui non seulement n'a rien d'énigmatique, mais qui est la personnification même de l'honnêteté et de la délicatesse. Je dirai plus: du moment que la marquise n'est

⁷ Eugène Rigal: *Molière*, 1908, II, 213.

⁸ *Le Bourgeois Gentilhomme*, III, 18.

pas une "affreuse drôlesse," et qu'elle n'est pas "complice" de Dorante, et je crois vraiment que la lecture du rôle même le prouve, il *faut*, du point de vue de la pièce même, qu'elle soit foncièrement honnête. Pourquoi? Voici: Nous n'avons pas affaire ici avec un couple d'aventuriers, nous avons un jeune homme sans argent qui veut épouser une marquise, probablement bien rentée, et c'est pour la conquérir qu'il exploite Jourdain. Il faut donc que la marquise soit honnête, car, si elle ne l'était pas, elle soupçonnerait la combinaison: il pourrait lui venir à l'idée que le diamant, par exemple, vient de Jourdain et non pas du comte. Elle est peut-être un peu naïve, mais cela ajoute encore à son honnêteté. Dorante et Molière l'ont donc choisie vertueuse exprès pour qu'elle ne soupçonne rien.

Suis-je donc seul en face de la critique? La situation serait embarrassante. Heureusement je trouve un critique, un seul qui me justifie complètement, et c'est un homme à qui on reconnaît quelque bon sens: Francisque Sarcey écrit dans un feuillet:

Dorimène doit être, à ce qu'il me semble, une jeune veuve un peu légère[?], sans doute, mais honnête, mais spirituelle, qui voit la meilleure compagnie et qui est très digne d'être reçue par elle. Elle ne sait rien des turpitudes de ce Dorante qui lui fait la cour, elle accepte ses dîners et ses cadeaux sans se douter qu'un autre les paie; elle rit du bourgeois gentilhomme sans soupçonner que le plus clair de sa fortune vient de lui[?]; elle ne songe qu'au mariage, qui raccommode toute chose. Elle ne doit exciter ni commisération ni mépris, ni haine: c'est une jolie, jeune personne qui marche gentiment sur un pavé crotté, sans y salir le bord de sa bottine. C'est la Dorimène de Molière, telle qu'il l'a vue et représentée sur la scène.*

Si Sarcey a déjà dit cela en 1862, pourquoi crois-je nécessaire de le répéter? Parce que, si le passage que je viens de citer est très net, il est entouré d'un commentaire qui l'obscurcit: Sarcey commence en effet ce paragraphe par ces mots: "Il y a *deux* façons d'interpréter le rôle de la marquise," et il ajoute sitôt après le passage cité:

Mais on peut encore prendre ce rôle d'une autre façon. Dorimène peut fort bien être une coquette sur le retour. . . . Je ne crois pas, à parler franc, que ce soit là le vrai sens du rôle, mais l'interprétation une fois admise il faut avouer que l'actrice qui en était chargée l'a joué avec beaucoup de naturel. Molière ne se serait pas reconnu mais il eût applaudi.

* Francisque Sarcey: *Quarante ans de Théâtre*, 1885, II, 174.

C'est probablement à cause de ces quelques contradictions que cet article n'a en réalité produit aucune impression : tous les passages cités plus haut condamnant la marquise sont en effet postérieurs à cet article. Sarcey lui-même ne semble pas très convaincu puisqu'il cite ailleurs¹⁰ sans aucun commentaire ces lignes de Théodore Reinach : "Quand Molière met en scène des *coquins* de cette sorte, Dorante et *Dorimène* du *Bourgeois Gentilhomme*, *Tartuffe*, il se garde bien de leur témoigner sa sympathie et il les met dehors au dernier acte." Dorimène associée maintenant avec *Tartuffe* !

D'où vient cette méconnaissance persistante du vrai caractère de Dorimène ? J'en vois trois explications possibles : La première est suggérée par l'article même de Sarcey : les actrices semblent donner à Dorimène ce caractère généralement accepté. La raison en paraît assez évidente : il n'existe pour le rôle de Dorimène aucune tradition écrite ; mais, comme me l'écrit le Régisseur Général de la Comédie Française, "la marquise appartient à l'emploi des Coquettes,¹¹ et bien que le rôle soit secondaire il est toujours joué par la première coquette. Son importance, pour relative qu'elle soit, étant cependant très grande pour l'équilibre de la pièce de Molière." Quoi de plus naturel pour la "première coquette" que de forcer un peu le rôle, le rapprocher de son emploi, et ne pas insister particulièrement sur ce qu'il a de naïf et d'honnête ?

La seconde explication est en germe dans le nom même de notre héroïne, qui a très bien pu provoquer la confusion : nous trouvons dans l'édition Despois-Mesnard :

Il semble qu'en 1645 il [le nom Dorimène] servait à désigner de vraies courtisanes. . . . On se rappelle que Molière, dans le *Mariage Forcé*, a donné ce même nom à la "coquette achevée" qui mène Sganarelle à ses fins. Il a voulu sans doute, en le choisissant pour la marquise que M. Jourdain a faite et déclare dame de ses pensées, attacher tout d'abord au personnage une idée de galanterie et d'aventure.¹²

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 245.

¹¹ La raison pourrait bien en être que le rôle a probablement été créé par Mlle de Brie (*Œuvres de Molière*. Edition : Les Grands Ecrivains de la France, 1883, VIII, 27), qui jouait les coquettes et les précieuses, mais je me plais à remarquer qu'elle jouait aussi la femme de Sganarelle qui n'est pas précisément une coquette, et dans le *Mariage Forcé* elle joue "une Egyptienne" tandis que c'est la Duparc qui joue Dorimène "jeune coquette."

¹² *Œuvres de Molière*. Edition : Les Grands Ecrivains de la France, 1883, VIII, 43.

Mais l'auteur de la note se contredit immédiatement quand il dit: "Dorimène avait été au théâtre un simple nom d'amoureuse; il l'est par exemple dans les *Vendanges de Suresnes*, comédie de du Ryer (1635)." Donc le nom même n'implique en aucune façon "le caractère de galanterie et d'aventure." Le malheur veut que ce nom ait été repris plus tard par Dancourt et par Lesage, pour des rôles insignifiants sans doute, mais dans un monde bien différent de celui qui entoure le Bourgeois, et que cette association ait confirmé de plus en plus la mauvaise réputation du nom même de Dorimène.¹³

Et ceci nous amène à la troisième explication, plus plausible encore, du discrédit dans lequel est tombée ma marquise, et qui s'offre d'elle-même dans toutes les citations ci-dessus: c'est-à-dire la confusion qui s'est faite dans l'esprit des critiques entre ce personnage de Molière et certains personnages de Lesage par exemple. Rappelons-nous en effet que ce nom de Dorimène n'est qu'une des nombreuses ressemblances, et certainement la moins importante, entre *Le Bourgeois Gentilhomme* et *Turcaret*, qui est bourré de souvenirs de la pièce de Molière: Turcaret est amoureux de la baronne, il lui écrit un billet dont on se moque, il lui offre un banquet accompagné de chants, il lui donne une bague, il voudrait qu'une trompette accompagne le chant. *Turcaret* semble souvent un écho du *Bourgeois*.¹⁴ Quoi d'étonnant donc à ce que les critiques confondent dans leurs jugements aujourd'hui les personnages de ces deux pièces, et que, comme Dorante est, lui, une ébauche du chevalier de *Turcaret*, on soit amené à penser que son amie Dorimène correspond à la baronne qui gruge Turcaret?¹⁵ Et cela est

¹³ "Vous avez eu quelque démêlé de carrosse à carrosse avec une marquise qu'on nomme Dorimène." (Dancourt: *Le Chevalier à la mode*, III, 2.) Dans *Turcaret* Mme Jacob se présente "de la part de Mme Dorimène" et est reçue immédiatement. (Lesage: *Turcaret*, IV, 9.)

¹⁴ "A la représentation de *Turcaret* la première impression des contemporains fut celle de quelque chose déjà vu: 'Mais c'est le *Bourgeois Gentilhomme*!', disait-on. Rappelez-vous la comédie de Molière: M. Jourdain se couvre de vêtements magnifiques, il fait la connaissance d'une marquise des plus aimables, Dorimène, Turcaret, lui aussi a une baronne. . . ." (*Conférences faites aux matinées classiques du Théâtre National de l'Odéon*, 1896, VII, 16, Conférence par G. Larroumet.)

¹⁵ "Pour écrire une des comédies les plus fortes du siècle suivant, Lesage n'aura qu'à combiner ce Harpin (de la *Comtesse d'Escarbagnas*) avec le Dorante et la Dorimène du *Bourgeois Gentilhomme*." (Eugène Lintilhac: *Histoire du Théâtre en France*, 1908, III, 281.) Cette confusion entre les

si vrai qu'avant les critiques que j'ai cités, qui comparent toujours Dorimène avec les personnages de Lesage, on ne mentionne jamais la pauvre marquise, dont le rôle est en somme si secondaire. Les frères Parfaict par exemple citent tous les personnages du *Bourgeois*, sauf Dorimène.¹⁶ Mais depuis le XVIII^e siècle elle a pris une importance nouvelle, et surtout elle se trouve identifiée avec la sinistre famille des personnages de Dancourt et Lesage. On l'appelle leur mère; elle est en vérité, la Dorimène des critiques, l'héritière infortunée de tous ces escrocs. Ceux-ci je ne les défendrai pas, pas plus que je n'ai eu la prétention de défendre Dorante, mais je déplore le fait que la pauvre marquise a été jetée en cette compagnie, et que les critiques se refusent à l'en délivrer.

RENÉ TALAMON

University of Michigan

SOBRE EL PASAJE DEL QUIJOTE REFERENTE AL TIRANT LO BLANCH

El artículo del Profesor H. H. Arnold¹ vuelve a poner en tela de juicio este famoso pasaje, tradicionalmente considerado "el más oscuro del *Quijote*."² De nada ha servido la nota—tan luminosa—de B. Sanvisenti;³ de nada el magistral estudio de Américo Castro.⁴

personnages des deux pièces est si réelle que Hervier par exemple dira: "le chevalier Dorante" en parlant du Dorante de Molière. (M. Hervier: *Les Ecrivains français jugés par leurs contemporains*, 1929, I, 386.)

¹⁶ "Le sens droit de Madame Jourdain, la complaisance intéressée de *Dorante*, la gayeté ingénue de Nicole, le bon esprit de Lucile, la noble franchise de Cléonte, la subtilité féconde de Covielle; et la burlesque vanité des différents maîtres d'arts et de sciences, jettent encore un nouveau jour sur le caractère de M. Jourdain." (*Histoire du Théâtre Français* des Frères Parfaict, 1747, XI, 59.)

¹ *Modern Language Notes*, vol. I, 1935, págs. 182-185.

² Véase la historia del problema en Rodríguez Marín: *Don Quijote*, t. VII, 1928, apéndice, págs. 172-180.

³ *RFE.*, t. IX, 1922, págs. 58-62.

⁴ *El Pensamiento de Cervantes*, 1925. Véase especialmente la sección, *Armonía y disonancia*, págs. 20-23. En realidad la solución última de nuestro problema está tácitamente contenida en este libro de Castro aun cuando por razones de exposición el autor no se ocupara directamente del asunto.

Vislumbrábamos ya—en relación con la totalidad del pensamiento estético de Cervantes—cuál hubiera de ser el verdadero significado de su comentario crítico sobre el *Tirant lo blanch*, y se quiere ahora desandar el camino, para recaer, por vericuetos extraviados, en estériles interpretaciones filológicas.

La dificultad del pasaje—reléase una vez más—se debe a la aparente contradicción allí encerrada. Hace Cervantes un elogio (¿directo?, ¿irónico?) del *Tirant lo blanch*; a renglón seguido condena (¿directamente?, ¿irónicamente?), al autor que lo había compuesto. Fúndase el elogio: 1º., en que el libro es “un tesoro de contento y una mina de pasatiempos”; 2º., en que contiene personajes y ocurrencias tales como “don Quirieleisón de Montalbán, valeroso caballero . . . y las agudezas de la doncella Placerdemivida, con los amores y embustes de la viuda Reposada, etc.”; 3º., en que es un libro excepcional entre todos los de caballerías: “por su estilo, es éste el mejor libro del mundo: aquí comen los caballeros, y duermen y mueren en sus camas, y hacen testamento antes de su muerte, con otras cosas de que todos los demás libros deste género carecen.” Ahora bien, ¿en qué se basa Cervantes para condenar al autor? En que no escribió tales disparates de intento (“pues no hizo tantas necedades de industria”).

El sentido gramatical de todo el pasaje queda perfectamente claro, sin que falte ni sobre la menor cosa; la expresión *de industria* no puede constituir serio problema, pues bien conocido es su significado, *de intento*, *de propósito*, y con este valor aparece repetidas veces en Cervantes;⁵ del término *necedades* poseemos un curiosísimo ejemplo cervantino que viene a confirmar este sentido especial de *disparate* o *extravagancia*.⁶ ¿En qué consiste, pues, la

⁵ “. . . salió a buscar luz, para buscar y prender los delincuentes; mas no la halló, porque el ventero, *de industria*, había muerto la lámpara. . .” *Don Quijote*, I, 16 (RM I, 466, 4) Otros casos: *Don Quijote*, I, 9 (RM I, 296, 1); I, 27 (RM II, 358, 8); *El Celoso Extremeño*, Clás. Cast. pág. 122; *El Casamiento Engañoso*, Clás. Cast. pág. 180.

⁶ “. . . póngame yo una por una en el Toboso, y delante de mi señora Dulcinea; que yo le diré tales cosas de las *necedades* y *locuras*, que *todo es uno*, que vuestra merced ha hecho y queda hacio. . .” I, 15 (RM II, 300, 3). Es enteramente gratuita la suposición de Rodríguez Marín: “obscenas bellaquerías o necedades, como eufemísticamente las llama el cura” (*loc. cit.*). Pensara lo que pensara de su señor, Sancho no hubiera calificado nunca a don Quijote de necio, obsceno o bellaco, sino más bien de loco, extravagante y fantástico.

dificultad? Sin duda, en desentrañar el contenido crítico de la contraposición, que no contradicción, entre alabanza y condena.

Nada tenemos que objetar a la interpretación—definitiva—de Sanvisenti. Nos hemos de limitar, por lo tanto, a una aducción de pruebas que corroboren y remachen la solución del hispanista italiano.⁷

Si bien se mira, el comentario de Cervantes sobre *Tirant lo blanch* no es otra cosa sino la aplicación a un caso particular, de aquel principio estético que informa todo el *Quijote*, y aun toda la obra cervantina: transposición a un plano irónico de aquello que ya se encuentra situado en un plano o bien de Arte, o bien de Experiencia. Y ese mismo concepto crítico que Cervantes expresa como de pasada y en forma excesivamente elíptica al comentar el *Tirant*, vuelve a surgir—esta vez con pleno significado teórico—en el siguiente pasaje del *Viaje del Parnaso*:⁸

¿Cómo puede agradar un desatino,
sino es que de propósito se hace,
mostrándole el donaire su camino?

Desatino, es decir, *necedades*; *de propósito*, es decir, *de industria*. Hasta aquí, idéntico pensamiento en ambos pasajes. Ahora, la introducción del tercer elemento, *donaire*, al completar el juicio, aclara súbitamente el sentido del comentario al *Tirant*, disipando su tenebrosa oscuridad. Cervantes condena al autor por haber escrito esos divertidos disparates llanamente, en pura ingenuidad y sin segunda intención irónica.

Y ciertamente nada de sorprendente puede ofrecer esta actitud crítica tan cervantina, tan esencialmente siglo XVI. Para el Renacimiento, la fantasmagoría ojival del mundo de caballerías es una rica cantera de material poético; pero material para ser recreado en nueva visión, con nuevo estilo: perspectiva y escorzo, intelectualización, motivación psicológica, ironía. Véase elaborando

⁷ He aquí, en lo más esencial, la interpretación de Sanvisenti: "... ma l'autore del romanzo, che ebbe tante chicche di sale in testa de capire tutto questo e da tirar giù, per così dire, dal mondo della luna quei benedetti cavalieri e non capì, come avrebbe dovuto, che le tante solite *necedades* bisogna scriverle a bella posta, per farle deridere, per mostrare che lo son scempiaggini, che giudizio merita? Vada alla galera a vita, poichè tradì il suo buon senso e non capì quanto capì mirabilmente il Cervantes che cio è *tantas necedades* si può scriverli sì, ma *de industria*" (loc. cit.).

⁸ Edic. Schevill-Bonilla, págs. 84-85.

la nueva forma caballeresca en el *Morgante*, *Orlando innamorato*, *Orlando furioso*, Gil Vicente—modalidad plateresca española—; culmina, finalmente, en el genial contrapunto del *Quijote*.

Cuando Cervantes vuelve los ojos hacia el *Tirant lo blanch* descubre allí ciertos asomos, destellos, anticipaciones de la nueva poética; todo ello, sin embargo, cosa inconsciente y por realizar. Y con un gesto de humorística severidad impone al autor—que no había sabido darse cuenta de tan maravillosas posibilidades—la pena de galeras perpetuas. ¿Qué menos? Por su delito de leso Arte bien merecidas las tenía.

AUGUSTO CENTENO

Princeton University

A NOTE ON DESPORTES AND DU BELLAY

Ariosto's Orlando, grieving over the perfidy of his sweetheart, is described as so full of sorrow that his emotion, like water held in a narrow-necked bottle, cannot force its way out, but remains choked within him (*O. F.* XXIII, 113). The simile is novel; Du Bellay, when he composed his mournful *Complainte du Desespéré* (*Œuvres de l'invention de l'auteur*, 1552) transposed it to the first person and made it a symbol of his own pent-up emotion.

Finding it again in a *Complainte* by Desportes (*Amours d'Hippolyte*, first pub., 1573) and noticing a certain thematic similarity between the two poems, I compared them, with interesting results. Du Bellay's *Complainte* is a long, rambling composition, inspired by the Book of Job, the gloomier portions of the *Æneid* and the *Odes* and *Epodes* of Horace, and, indubitably, the poet's private misfortunes. He begins with a prayer for sufficient strength to express his over-powering grief, to which he fears no means of portrayal are adequate. His youth knew some pleasures, but it is over; old age holds for him no prospect but the misery to which he was destined at birth. Innocent and harmless, he has been continually punished by men and by his adverse stars; he has found Justice to be a myth, blind Chance the real ruler of Earth and Heaven. And he resolves to prove by suicide whether the torments of the nether world are not preferable to those of ours.

Desportes's *Complainte* is much more brief. He omits the many historical examples and classical embellishments put in by Du

Bellay, but he tells the same tale and makes use of the same expressions; only, the ideas are arranged in a somewhat different order. Except for its first two stanzas, his *Complainte* is completely an imitation of passages in the *Complainte du Desespéré*:¹

COMPLAINTE

Quelle manie est égale à ma rage?
 Quel mal se peut à mon mal comparer?
 Je ne sçauroy ny crier ny pleurer,
 Pressé du deuil qui grossist mon courage.
 Hélas! j'estouffe, et la fureur soudaine
 Me clost l'ouye, et m'aveugle les yeux;
 Mais ce m'est heur de ne voir plus les cieux,
 Les cieux cruels, coupables de ma paine.

Au vase estroit maintenant je ressemble,
 Qui, tout plein d'eau, goute à goute la rand;
 Mon œil aussi larme à larme respand
 Ce qu'en mon cœur de rivières j'assemble.

Maudit le jour que premier je vey luire,
 Pour estre esclave à si forte douleur!
 Le ciel alors pleuvant tout son malheur,
 Versa sur moy ce qu'il avoit de pire.

Astres maudits, qui trop pleins de licence,
 Maux et plaisirs aux humains destinez,
 Puis qu'en naissant de nous vous ordonnez,
 Que nuist la faute, ou que sert l'innocence?

Hélas! de rien! j'en puis servir de preuve,
 Qui n'ay jamais un tourment merité;
 Et toutesfois par vostre cruauté
 Plus miserable au monde ne se treuve.

Tout est bandé pour me faire la guerre,
 Par mes amis mille ennuis je reçoys;
 Que doy-je faire? Il n'y a point pour moy
 De dieux au ciel, ny de fortune en terre.

Dans les enfers cherchons donc allegeance,
 Parmi l'effroy, les fureurs et les cris,
 Accompagné des malheureux esprits,
 Qui pour ma peine oublieront leur souffrance.

Hastons la mort, seul but du miserable;
 Mais, tout ainsi que mes jours ont esté
 Couverts d'ennuis, d'horreur, d'obscurité,
 Soit mon trespas horrible et detestable.

¹ Du Bellay's lines are quoted from his *Œuvres poétiques*, ed. H. Chamard, Paris, Hachette, 1919, iv, 87-110 (Soc. des textes fr. mod.). Desportes's *Complainte* is found in his *Œuvres*, ed. A. Michiels, Paris, Delahays, 1858,

LINES FROM THE 'COMPLAINTE DU DESESPERE'

Au vase estroict, qui degoute
 Son eau, qui veult sortir toute,
 Ores semblable je suis: (37-39)
 Mauldicte donq' la lumiere
 Qui m'esclaira la premiere,
 Puits que le ciel rigoureux
 Assujettit ma naissance
 A l'indomtable puissance
 D'ung astre si malheureux. (409-414)
 Di-vine majesté haulte,
 D'ou me viennent, sans ma faulte,
 Tant de remors furieux?
 O malheureuse innocence,
 Sur qui ont tant de licence
 Les astres injurieux! (469-474)
 Las, pourquoy ne se retire
 De moy ce cruel martyre,
 Si mes innocentes mains,
 Pures de sang & rapines,
 Ne feurent onques inclines
 A rompre les droictz humains? (421-426)
 Si l'injure desrignée
 De la fortune aveuglée,
 Si ung faulx bon-heur promis
 Par les faveurs journalieres,
 Si les fraudes familiares
 De trop courtizans amis, . . . (97-102)
 Il est temps de faire espreuve,
 Si apres la mort on treuve
 La fin de tant de malheurs. (489-492)

ALICE CAMERON

Maryland College for Women

"WES DAS HERZ VOLL IST, DES GEHET DER
 MUND ÜBER"

This verse, occurring in the first edition (1522) and all subsequent editions of Luther's New Testament, has since become a familiar quotation, cited as such by Büchmann.¹ Moreover, Luther pp. 155-6. It is hardly necessary to add that his opening stanza is inspired by Lamentations, I, 12.

¹ *Geflügelte Worte. Der Zitatenschatz des deutschen Volkes gesammelt von Georg Büchmann, 23. Aufl., Berlin, 1907, p. 52.*

himself, in his *Sendbrief vom Dolmetschen* (1530)² uses this translation of Matthew 12, 34 (cp. Luke 6, 45) as a sample of idiomatic rendition:

Als wenn Christus spricht: Ex abundantia cordis os loquitur. Wenn ich den Eseln sol folgen, die werden mir die buchstaben furlegen, und also dolmetschen: Auß dem uberflus des hertzen redet der mund. Sage mir, Ist das deutsch geredt? Welcher deutscher verstehet solchs? Was ist uberflus des hertzen fur ein ding? Das kan kein deutscher sagen, Er wolt denn sagen, es sey das einer allzu ein gros hertz habe oder zu vil hertzes habe, wie wol das auch noch nicht recht ist: denn uberflus des hertzen ist kein deutsch, so wenig, als das deutsch ist, Uberflus des hauses, uberflus des kacheloffens, uberflus der banck, sondern also redet die mütter ym haus und der gemeine man: Wes das hertz vol ist, des gehet der mund uber, das heist gut deutsch geredt, des ich mich geflissen, und leider nicht allwege erreicht noch troffen habe, Denn die lateinischen buchstaben hindern aus der massen, seer gut deutsch zu reden.

Luther's coinage of this phrase thus seems to be definitely established. It can be cited, however, from the *Evangelibuch* of Johann Geiler von Kaisersberg,³ published seven years before Luther's New Testament:

(ex habundantia cordus os loquor) was das hertz vol ist, des loufft der mund vber (fol. 152 verso, col. 2).

The misprints (*cordus, loquor, was*) need not disturb us, particularly as Geiler had no hand in the publication of the work, which first appeared seven years after the author's death, from a copy prepared by one of his hearers (*vß seinem mund von wort zu wort geschriben*). The only difference between the two texts is *louft vber* (Geiler) as against *gehet uber* (Luther), and this is merely a matter of individual choice, or perhaps of dialect.

According to the testimony of Johann Adelphus, adduced by Ernst Martin in the *Allgemeine deutsche Biographie* (VIII, 514)

² Luthers *Werke*, Weimarer Ausgabe, 30. Bd. 2. Abt. p. 637.

³ Das Euangelibûch Das buoch der Ewangelien durch das ganz iar, Mitt Predig vnd vñlegungen durch den wirdigen hochgelerten Doctor Johannes geiler von Keisersperg der zeit Predicant in dem hohen stift der Keiserlichen freien stat Straßburg . . . die er in seinen fier letsten Jaren gepredigt hat. Vnd daz vß seinem mund von wort zu wort geschriben. Anno. etc. M. d. vnd fier iar. . . Vnd ist vor nie getruckt. The *Privilegium* (fol. 2) is issued to: Dem Ersamen Johannes Grüningern . . . Straßburg . . . Actum Montags nach Martini Episcopi. Anno domini im xvc. vnd .xv. iar. The colophon at the end of the book also shows the date 1515.

it was Johannes Pauli who published Geiler's *Evangelibuch* in 1515, and again as *Evangelia mit vñlegung* in 1517. Either of these editions could have been in Luther's hands before he began the translation of the New Testament in 1521: a third edition of Geiler's work, published by Pauli in 1522 under the title *Evangelia das Plenarium*, is out of the question, on account of its date. All of these editions of Geiler are extremely rare; I had occasion, several years ago, to consult the *Evangelibuch* of 1515 at Berlin, for quite a different purpose, and incidentally noted this striking phrase: a detailed comparison with Luther's New Testament may yield further parallels. On the other hand, it is also possible that Geiler (or Pauli) and Luther, independently of Geiler, used a vernacular phrase that was current among the common people; in fact, Luther's words in the *Sendbrief* (*also redet die mütter ym haus und der gemeine man*) might be construed as supporting the latter alternative.

W. KURRELMEYER

L'ACCENT ALLEMAND DANS BALZAC

Dans la chronique littéraire de la *Revue Bleue* du 20 avril 1918, Monsieur Antoine Albalat signale l'abus que l'on fait de l'accent allemand au théâtre et dans le roman. Le romancier Balzac surtout, dit-il, a fastidieusement exagéré cette ridicule prononciation qu'il prête à plusieurs de ses personnages. Ce parti pris finit par rendre quelques-uns de ses livres très pénibles à lire.

On pourrait ajouter que, non seulement cette prononciation rend la lecture pénible, mais encore, qu'un Allemand éprouverait une réelle difficulté à parler comme Schmucke ou le Baron Nucingen. Le procédé de Balzac consiste à remplacer le plus possible de consonnes sonores par des sourdes et vice versa, à changer les voyelles au hasard de la plume ou à introduire des changements de fantaisie comme par exemple: *filtrais* (voudrais), *bland* (plan).

Or, quels sont les traits caractéristiques de la prononciation des Allemands lorsqu'ils parlent notre langue? Comme dans la leur, les consonnes plosives et fricatives finales seront sourdes et brèves. C'est donc à tort que Balzac écrit *graze*, *faides*, *lisdes*, *lambes*, etc.,

pour *grâce, faites, liste, lampes*. Même des consonnes muettes changent: *tand, jamb's* (tant, champs).¹

En parlant français les Allemands ont une tendance à dévocaliser les consonnes initiales et même médiales. Cependant, dans certaines régions les sourdes et les sonores sont employées les unes pour les autres.² Balzac aurait-il étudié les prononciations dialectales? Les mots qui suivent seraient-ils le fruit d'observations minutieuses: *bermeddez, habbardement, madin, dripinal* (tribunal), *irridier, tégorai* (décoré), *togdeur, orguesdre*, etc.?

Le *s* initial allemand se prononce *z*. Balzac tantôt le change en *z*, tantôt le laisse *s*. Ainsi on trouve *zoigné* et *soigné*, *zuis* et *suis*, *ziblime* (sublime) et *sir* (sur), etc. Le *s* intervocalique que les Allemands prononcent *ss* est quelquefois écrit correctement *ss*, souvent cependant *s* ou même pire *Z*: *rézonaple, cezi*. Le son de *J* ne se trouve guère que dans des mots d'emprunt, et nous savons combien les Allemands ont de la peine à prononcer ce son. Balzac est donc justifié de transcrire *je* ou *gens* par *che* et *chens*. Mais quand il écrit *gerger, jarmant, gefeux*, il cherche la difficulté et ce pauvre Schmucke prononcerait beaucoup plus aisément *chercher, charmant et chefeux*. D'autres fois les changements résultent en combinaisons presque impossibles à prononcer, que ce soit en allemand ou en français. Qu'on se rende compte, par exemple, de l'effort qu'il faudrait pour prononcer le groupe *gsbl* dans *egsbliquer* en conservant le son *ss*. De tous les changements que j'ai relevés, le plus inattendu est certainement celui que nous trouvons dans ces mots: *tcheu, tchaire, tchéneralle*, pour *je, chère* et *général*.

Mais, si on peut découvrir dans le traitement des consonnes un semblant de méthode, quoique pas toujours soutenue, les voyelles, par contre, sont traitées avec la plus désinvolte fantaisie. Cependant notre système de voyelles diffère peu de celui des Allemands et la seule remarque qu'on puisse faire, c'est que les voyelles brèves sont relâchées et manquent peut-être de netteté, pas au point, en tout cas, de justifier les changements que nous trouvons dans Balzac.

Les *u* deviennent *i*, mais ce défaut d'arrondissement des lèvres se rencontre dans certaines prononciations dialectales, le change-

¹ Tous les exemples sont pris dans le *Cousin Pons*, *César Birotteau* et *La Maison Nucingen*.

² Les Saxons en particulier, selon M. H. C. Lancaster.

ment peut donc être considéré comme correct. On s'explique moins bien: *vordeine* (fortune), où *u* devient *ei*. Les *i* à leur tour deviennent *u*: *ruche* (riche), *chiste* (juste). Là encore, on peut admettre, à la rigueur, qu'une prononciation relâchée permette la confusion. Quant aux changements suivants on ne voit aucune explication possible: Les *eu* se changent au hasard en *i*, *ei*, *é* ou *u*: *tirecdir* (directeur), *cueir* et *quir* (cœur), *hire* et *heire* (heure), *seil* (seul), *indérière* (intérieur), *atié* (adieu), *fafure* (faveur), etc. Les *ou* se partagent *u* et *i*: *chur* (jour), *pir* (pour), *ébiser* (épouser), *vus* et *vis* (vous), *tude* (doute), etc. De temps en temps *é* devient *i*: *tis* (des) *iffits* (effets), ou même *a*: *ame* (aime). Enfin on trouve d'autres changements aussi bizarres qu'inattendus: *iffires* (affaires), *île ha ei* (il a eu), *mennessir* et *meinnesir* (monsieur), *quemission* (commission), *reuyaliste* (royaliste); *hai*, *ei*, *ai*, *ed* (et); *didde*, *tidde*, *dudde*, *tudde*, *doude* (toute); *ed*, *esd*, *esde*, *esdre*, *hai* (est), etc. Et même avec l'aide du texte, il faut de la bonne volonté pour arriver à comprendre certains mots, par exemple: *chisdivier* (justifier), *vichis* (fichu), *ti dud* (du tout), *fis* (oui), etc.

Ce qui prouve que le système de Balzac consistait à introduire le plus possible de changements orthographiques, ce sont des mots où ces changements ne modifient en rien la prononciation: *lais* (les), *soissante* (soixante), *ke* et *ki* (que et qui), *mîle* (mille), *home* (homme), *phâmme* (femme), *sant* (cent), etc.

En résumé, quand on lit le français que parlent le Baron Nucingen et le doux et inoffensif Schmucke, on pourrait croire que ces deux Allemands sont animés du plus regrettable esprit de contradiction en matière de prononciation, ou se font un malin plaisir d'estropier notre langue. Pour terminer je citerai quelques phrases prises parmi les plus caractéristiques et laisserai au lecteur le plaisir d'en découvrir le sens:

Bons m'a did que j'étais enduré de goguins.

Gu'imborde ou l'on meird!

Vis ki fis edes vaite plessier.

Cesde gonfeni.

C'hai neiffe cende vrancs de rende.

Mon seil pessoin esd te vimer ma bibe.

RENÉ DAUDON

Haverford, Pa.

THE PLOT OF CONRAD'S *THE DUEL*

Of the genesis of his brilliantly ironic story of *The Duel* Joseph Conrad, thirteen years later, said in his preface to *A Set of Six* in the Personal Edition:¹

Its pedigree is extremely simple. It springs from a ten-line paragraph in a small provincial paper published in the South of France. That paragraph, occasioned by a duel with fatal ending between two well-known Parisian personalities, referred for some reason or other to the "well-known fact" of two officers in Napoleon's Grand Army having fought a series of duels in the midst of great wars and on some futile pretext. The pretext was never disclosed. I had therefore to invent it; and I think that, given the character of the two officers which I had to invent, too, I have made it sufficiently convincing by the mere force of its absurdity.

The statement sounds sincere, and was almost certainly made in good faith. In fact, however, Conrad must have read much more than he remembered. Not the mere germ of the story but its whole outline, including the "futile pretext" Conrad claims as his own, had long been in print. The version which follows appeared in *Harper's Magazine* for September 1858.² So close are the parallels that the text must be quoted in full:

The late Paris duels have called up the subject of dueling anew; and among the most extraordinary affairs of that nature which inquiry has brought to light, is the story of a duel commencing in 1794 and ending only in 1813. . . .

In 1794, then, there lived a Captain of hussars, Fournier by name, at Strasbourg, who was the most hot-headed and quarrelsome man in all that region. Again and again he had slain his man in duels, but no successes seemed to satiate his taste for this sort of murder. On one occasion he had wantonly provoked a young man, named Blumm—who was a great favorite among the good bourgeoisie of Strasbourg—and as wantonly had slain him.

The whole town was full of excitement, and the whole town condemned Fournier as his murderer. Still, dueling was honorable; who should venture to punish the murderer, who was only [a] duelist?

It happened that, upon the night of the burial of poor Blumm, a great ball, long time announced, was given by the military commander of the

¹ New York, 1920, p. x. Conrad wrote the story at Montpellier during December, 1906, and January, 1907 (see G. Jean-Aubrey, *Joseph Conrad Life and Letters*, New York, 1927, II, 4). It was separately published in America in 1908 as *The Point of Honour*.

² XVII, 559-60. The item is part of "Our Foreign Gossip" in "The Editor's Easy Chair."

place. Fournier was among the invited guests; but the general commanding, foreseeing what unpleasant *rencontres* might grow out of his presence, gave orders to his aid-de-camp, Captain Dupont, to station himself at the door, and, citing the order of the general, to give *congé* to Fournier.

Dupont accepted the commission. Fournier in due time presented himself. Dupont addressed him: "Fournier, what are you doing here on the night of poor Blumm's burial?"

"Ah! *c'est toi*, Dupont; *bon!* I come to the ball, naturally enough."

"And I am here to prevent you, by my general's orders."

"Ah! *c'est ça!* I can not fight the general, for his rank; you will, perhaps, have no objection?—you who commit impertinences at second-hand."

Dupont accepted the challenge; in a few days they fought, and Dupont succeeded in giving the desperado a severe sword wound; but Fournier, even as he fell, claimed a new meeting. On his recovery another duel was fought, in which Fournier wounded Dupont severely. But Dupont, maddened by the ruffianism of his antagonist, and trusting to his skill, insisted, upon his recovery, on a third trial. Fournier declared for pistols, being himself unfailing in his aim, and amusing himself on leisure evenings by shattering the pipes in the mouths of the soldiers with pistol-balls.

Dupont, however, claimed a privilege of the military service, and the trial was renewed with swords. Both were slightly wounded. Upon this a duel convention was drawn up between them (still in existence), running in this way:

1st. As often as MM. Dupont and Fournier find themselves within thirty leagues of each other, they shall meet half-way between, for a duel with swords.

2d. If either of the combatants finds himself restrained by the exigencies of the service, the other shall make the entire journey, in order to effect a meeting.

3d. No excuse, except such as may grow out of the exigences of military duty, shall be admissible.

The convention was executed in good faith; on every occasion when it was possible for the two hot-heads to meet, they met, and fought desperately.

A most extraordinary correspondence sprung up between them, of which we give a sample.

"I am invited," writes one, "to breakfast with the staff of *chasseurs*, at Luneville; and since you are in that place, upon leave of absence, I shall accept the invitation, and shall hope for the opportunity of giving you another sword thrust.

"Truly yours."

Or again:

"Dear Friend,—I shall pass through Strasbourg at noon, on the 5th of November next. You will find me at the Hôtel des Postes: we will have a fight."

Sometimes the promotion of one or the other, by destroying their military equality, interfered with the prosecution of their agreeable engagements. Thus Fournier writes:

"My dear Dupont,—I learn that the Emperor has made you General of Brigade. Accept my felicitations. The appointment gives me special pleasure, since it restores you to equality of rank with me, and gives us opportunity to renew fight, which I shall surely do on the first occasion."

The affair, naturally enough, attracted great attention in its day. Each bore the marks of numerous wounds: each was anxious to compass the death of the other. Both, however, were admirable swordsmen, and held religiously to the law of the duel, which forbade a second thrust after blood had once been drawn.

On one occasion, it is related that they met unexpectedly by night in a chalet of Switzerland.

"Ah, Dupont, it is you! Let us fight!"

Dupont threw aside his cloak, and put himself in position. As they parried thrust after thrust, the following conversation took place:

"*Parbleu!* I thought you were in the interior."

"No, I am ordered here."

"Good! We shall be near by. Are you lately arrived?"

"This instant."

"Very good to think of me." And as he spoke Dupont's sword pierced his neck-cloth, grazing his neck, and pinning him to the wall.

The noise of the altercation had drawn in officers from a neighboring chalet, who separated the antagonists.

So through fourteen years the long duel trailed, satisfaction not being given or gained.

At length Dupont found himself on the eve of marriage. His *fiancée* insisted the strife should be ended. He paid a visit to Fournier; he represented to him the inconvenience of the feud and the intervention of his bride. He proposed a final meeting.

A duel should be fought with pistols.

Fournier, conscious of his force in that way, expressed surprise.

Dupont says, "I know this. But I have a scheme to put us on a level. A friend of mine has a pleasant copse, inclosed by a high wall; there are two gates—one to the north, one to the south. At noon precisely, tomorrow, you shall enter at the north gate, pistol in hand; I shall enter by the south. Once within the copse, each shall seek his occasion to fire."

The terms were accepted. At noon the next day they entered; the gates were closed; they advanced cautiously from thicket to thicket. At length they discovered each other, and at the same instant each took refuge behind a trunk. Five minutes passed: Dupont slowly thrust his arm beyond shelter; the bark flew, there was a quick report, and one ball of Fournier's was lost. Five minutes more, and Dupont cautiously thrust his hat into sight: on the instant it was pierced, the ball grazing his fingers.

He now marched out coolly: Fournier left his shelter, with the empty pistol in his hand—cool to the last.

Dupont took deliberate aim at his heart—stopped. "I have your life in my hands," said he. "I give it you on on this condition—that if you ever harass me, or provoke me to renew this long fight, I shall have the benefit of two balls before you fire." The conditions were accepted; the fourteen years of duel were ended; Dupont was married; the story is done.

Save that he reduced his officers a step in rank, and half altered Dupont into D'Hubert and Fournier into Feraud, Conrad took the initial situation practically as it stood. In his story the scene is still Strasbourg, Feraud a hussar, D'Hubert on the commandant's staff. The provocation is the same: Feraud has killed a civilian—whose name, however, Conrad omits as immaterial—in a duel, and D'Hubert interrupts his attendance at a social gathering by delivering the general's orders for his immediate return to quarters. Even the wording of Feraud's challenge is similar: "I can't call the general to account for his behaviour, but you are going to answer me for yours."

In the ensuing three duels, Conrad follows the same sequence: Feraud is wounded in the first, D'Hubert in the second, both are injured in the third. The later events also follow the same general order, with frequent interruptions to hostilities by service on different fronts and temporary inequality in rank. In Conrad's version, likewise, the feud ends, just before D'Hubert's marriage, with a pistol duel wherein the combatants stalk each other in a wood. Feraud, like Fournier, is the better shot: D'Hubert draws his fire, and Feraud's bullet chips the bark of the tree. Feraud's fruitless expenditure of his second and last shot leaves him no choice but to accept D'Hubert's terms, and D'Hubert is free to marry and live happy.

Some of Conrad's modifications are significant. By advancing the initial date from 1794 to 1800 he gives unity of background, with the discipline and glamor of Napoleon always a part of the picture. (Anyway, the dates in the *Harper* story are irreconcilable with the twice repeated statement that the duel lasted fourteen years.) By introducing numerous minor characters Conrad not only enriches the social and military panorama of the background but achieves such details of pattern as the Alsatian maid's attempted intervention for Feraud in the first duel and Adèle's for D'Hubert in the last. Moreover, the first duel, like the last, is fought without the presence of seconds. For the formal contract and exchange of letters, Conrad substitutes a series of personal

glimpses of the combatants which culminates in the epic details of the retreat from Moscow. And finally, in the pistol fight, Conrad supplies, instead of Dupont's somewhat ignoble repetition of the same ruse to draw Fournier's fire, the richly comic details of D'Hubert's attempt, by means of a primitive periscope, to watch his front and his rear at the same time.

What then are we to conclude in regard to Conrad's statement in the 1920 preface? It seems incredible that a man of his intellectual and artistic integrity would have claimed credit for inventing details which he knew were borrowed. Even if he wished for some reason to conceal the extent of his indebtedness he had only to word his statement a little more vaguely. The following explanation is admittedly pure conjecture, but it seems plausible.

The story in *Harper's* is obviously a close paraphrase from some French newspaper. No doubt the tale, as so often happens, continued to appear in the papers whenever editors were short of material or when current events offered an excuse for reviving it. In all likelihood Conrad read it during his apprenticeship in French vessels out of Marseilles between 1874 and 1878. When he came again, thirty years later, on a brief reference to the story, the earlier reading had passed completely out of his conscious memory. He was working under heavy strain in 1906 and 1907: his wife and children had been seriously ill; he himself had suffered repeated attacks of gout, following the "bronchitis, influenza, and an obstinate insomnia" which had afflicted him in Capri in 1905³; the ever-present worry over finances was more intense than usual. It would scarcely be exaggeration to say that his mental condition during much of this time was like Sir Walter Scott's when he wrote *The Bride of Lammermoor*. In such circumstances he may well have thought that he was inventing details when in fact he was merely drawing them from his subconscious memory.

In any case, the discovery of the source does not affect the artistic validity of the finished work. It merely puts *The Duel* in the same class with *The Inn of the Two Witches*, where also Conrad used a traditional story of which the literary possibilities had never before been adequately developed. He was right in telling J. B. Pinker that *The Duel* was good.⁴ Its having come to

³ Jean-Aubrey, II, 2.

⁴ *Ibid.*, 41.

him ready-made as to plot simply explains why it is so much gayer than most of the stories he developed from his own resources.

J. DELANCEY FERGUSON

Western Reserve University

A SOURCE OF CONRAD'S *SUSPENSE*

In Joseph Conrad's last and unfinished novel, *Suspense*, there is a description of a meeting between 'Adèle' and Napoleon Bonaparte. 'Adèle' remarks that he spoke to her but once, at a ball; and continues:

In the intervals of dancing the Emperor came down alone, speaking only to the women. . . . When he came opposite me he stopped. I am certain he knew who I was, but he asked me my name. I told him.

'Your husband lives in his province?'

'Yes, sire.'

'Your husband employs much labour, I hear. I am grateful to him for giving work to the people. This is the proper use of wealth. Hasn't he served in the English army in India?'

His tone was friendly. I said I didn't know that, but I did know that he had fought against them there.

He smiled in a fascinating manner and said: 'That's very possible. A soldier of fortune. He is a native of Piedmont, is he not?'

'Yes, sire.'

'But you are French, entirely French. We have a claim on you. How old are you?'

I told him. He said: 'You look younger.' Then he came nearer to me and speaking in a confidential tone said: 'You have no children. I know, I know. It isn't your fault, but you should try to make some other arrangement. Believe me, I am giving you good advice.'

I was dumb with astonishment. He gave me again a very gracious smile and went on. That is the only conversation I ever had with the Emperor.¹

Not long after reading *Suspense* I happened to glance through the volumes of the *Memoirs of the Comtesse de Boigne*,² and came upon the following:

. . . the Emperor came down alone and went round the room, speaking exclusively to the ladies. . . . According to his custom, he also asked my name, which I told him.

¹ *Suspense*, New York, 1925, pp. 145-6.

² Ed. M. Charles Nicoullaud, New York, 1908.

'You live at Beauregard?'

'Yes, Sire.'

'It is a beautiful spot, and your husband employs much labour there; I am grateful to him for the service he does to the country, as I am to all who employ workmen. He has been in the English army? . . . He is a Savoyard, is he not?'

'Yes, Sire.'

'But you are French, entirely French, and we therefore claim you, for you are not one of those rights easily surrendered.'

I bowed.

'How old are you?'

I told him.

'And frank into the bargain. You look much younger.'

I bowed again. He stepped back half a pace, and then came up to me, speaking lower in a confidential tone:

'You have no children? I know that is not your fault, but you should make better arrangements. Believe me, I am giving you good advice.'

I remained stupefied; he looked at me for a moment with a gracious smile, and went on to my neighbour. . . .³

What incentive for research! Careful study of the other characters in Conrad's fascinating novel and of the life and family of the Comtesse de Boigne as told in her *Memoirs*, reveals other similarities. 'Dr. Martel,' the political agent of the story, resembles in both his name and the circumstances of his life, the English doctor, Joseph Head Marshall, who was associated with Dr. Edward Jenner of vaccine fame. Without doubt, Marshall forms the basis of the character 'Dr. Martel.' The character of 'Sir Charles Latham' is founded on that of Sir John Legard, an Englishman with an estate in Yorkshire, who, according to the *Memoirs*, married a Miss Aston after hearing that she had taken more seriously than he intended the attentions he had paid her. 'Sir Charles' in *Suspense* marries a 'Miss Aston'—and for the same reason. Lady Legard was beautiful, says the Comtesse de Boigne,

but absolutely unfitted to share the retirement of a distinguished man. . . . Her sole responsibility in the household was confined to the ordering the dinner. . . . She would never have dared to ask for a horse to go for a ride, much less to pay a call, but if her husband said to her in a solemn voice, 'My lady, it would be advisable for you to call at such and such a house,' her heart would leap for joy. 'Certainly, Sir John, most certainly,' and off she went to get out her finery.⁴

³ *Memoirs*, I, 244.

⁴ *Memoirs*, I, 106.

Conrad's description runs thus:

Her household power was confined to ordering the dinner. . . . She would never have dreamed of asking for horses for a visit in the neighbourhood, but when her husband remarked, 'I think it would be advisable for you, my lady, to call at such and such a house,' her face would light up, she would answer with alacrity, 'Certainly, Sir Charles,' and go off to array herself. . . .⁵

Sir John Legard is portrayed in the *Memoirs* as 'domineering, generous, imperious'; to his wife, 'always inconsiderate, and often severe; a perfect representative of the independent country gentleman. . . . He . . . was endowed with a brilliant intellect, the most delicate taste, the most lively imagination, with a supreme desire for intellectual intercourse. . . . In his youth he had been very handsome . . . but later had grown stout.'⁶

Conrad pictures him as 'Sir Charles Latham' in these words:

As the years went on Sir Charles aged more than he ought to have done, and even began to grow a little stout, but no one could fail to see that he had been a very handsome man in his time. . . . Without being gentle he was naturally kind and hospitable. His native generosity was so well known that no one was surprised when he offered the shelter of his Yorkshire house to a family of French refugees, the Marquis and the Marquise d'Armand, with their little daughter Adèle. They had arrived in England in a state of almost complete destitution, but with two servants who had shared the . . . miseries of their flight. . . .⁷

In another passage of the *Memoirs* the Comtesse de Boigne recalls interesting and personal details:

I was so excessively shy that I blushed whenever anyone spoke to me or looked at me. This failing is not always regarded with due sympathy. It was a real suffering in my case, and reached such a pitch that I was often choked by tears aroused by nothing but an excessive embarrassment which was quite unjustifiable.⁸

In *Suspense*, 'Adèle' talks with 'Cosmo' of her girlhood:

Would you believe that when I was a girl I was so shy that I used to blush crimson whenever anybody looked at me or spoke to me? It's a failing which does not meet with much sympathy. And yet my suffering was very real. It would reach such a pitch at times that I was ready to cry.⁹

She tells 'Cosmo' of the offer made for her hand by the 'Count de Monteverso':

⁵ *Suspense*, pp. 19-20.

⁶ *Memoirs*, I, 105, 107.

⁷ *Suspense*, pp. 20, 21.

⁸ *Memoirs*, I, 117.

⁹ *Suspense*, p. 129.

I was getting on for sixteen. . . . No one ever paid the slightest attention to me. The only genuine passion in my heart was filial love. . . . He [Montevesso] . . . left a most fugitive impression, but the very next morning he sent his English friend to ask my parents for my hand. . . .¹⁰

Here is the passage from the *Memoirs*:

I was sixteen years of age. No one had ever paid me the smallest attention—at any rate I had not noticed anything of the kind. . . . The only passion in my heart was filial love. . . . He [the Count de Boigne] came and went without attracting particular attention from us . . . and . . . commissioned [his friend] to ask my hand in marriage.¹¹

An interview was arranged at the house of a lady who was an intimate of the d'Osmonds, between the young girl and her suitor,—at her own request. The *Memoirs* continue:

He was exactly punctual. I then committed the grave though generous mistake of telling him that I did not care for him in the least, and probably never should, but that if he were willing to secure my parents' future independence, my gratitude would be so great that I could marry him without reluctance. . . . He assured me that he did not flatter himself with the possibility of inspiring any deeper feeling. . . . Twelve days later I was married. . . . General de Boigne was forty-nine years of age.¹²

And here is the same scene from the novel,—which 'Adèle' recalls for 'Cosmo.' She says:

They were some time in finding him. I waited. . . . He arrived out of breath. . . . I, who used to blush violently at the smallest provocation, didn't feel the slightest embarrassment in addressing that big stiff man so much older than myself. I could not appreciate what a fatal mistake I was committing by telling him I didn't care for him in the least, and probably never should; but that if he would secure my parents' future comfort my gratitude would be so great that I could marry him without reluctance and be his loyal friend and wife for life. He stood there stiff and ominous, and told me that he didn't flatter himself with the possibility of inspiring any deeper feeling. . . . Three weeks afterwards I was married.¹³

If Conrad had lived to finish his novel he might have indicated the sources from which he spun the fabric of *Suspense*—weaving to his glowing pattern, with his incomparable skill, the many strands of history and fiction. His genius caught and made to live again the atmosphere which at that period touched all the countries of

¹⁰ *Suspense*, pp. 132, 133.

¹² *Memoirs*, I, 132-3.

¹¹ *Memoirs*, I, 131.

¹³ *Suspense*, pp. 134, 136.

Europe—that feeling of *suspense* hanging like a mist above the restless whirlpool of events—which gave him the title for his story.

MIRIAM HATHEWAY WOOD

Saint John, New Brunswick, Canada

KATHERINE MANSFIELD AND CHEKHOV

The influence of Chekhov on Katherine Mansfield has often been remarked. She herself freely expressed admiration and a feeling of kinship for her Russian predecessor. Her husband, Mr. J. Middleton Murry, in his edition of her *Journal*, however, says that critics over-estimate her debt to Chekhov, and that her literary development would have been much the same had she never read his stories.

This may well be true. Yet a remarkable parallel is to be found between one of her early short stories, "The Child-Who-Was-Tired" from the volume *In a German Pension*, and a story of Chekhov's called, in its English versions, "Sleepyhead" or "Sleepy."¹ In *The Life of Katherine Mansfield* by R. E. Mantz and J. Middleton Murry² the inception of her story is described: "Superficially, it is a realistic story of peasant life; but in essence it is nothing of the kind. 'The Child who was Tired' is indubitably herself in the summer of 1909—the Katherine wearied with pain and crying in vain for rest—'the frightened child lost in a funeral procession.' The peasant household is not any peasant household that Katherine experienced—actually the Bavarian peasants were kind to her, and she liked them—but merely a symbol of her experience of life."

Yet the similarity between the two stories is too great for us to suppose them entirely independent. The central idea of Chekhov's tale would be unlikely to occur of itself to another writer. It is briefly, and so is Katherine Mansfield's, the story of a servant girl, who, overworked all day, is compelled to stay awake at night to

¹ This had appeared in an English translation by R. E. C. Long in 1903. "The-Child-Who-Was-Tired" was published originally, with the additional title of "Bavarian Babies" in *The New Age* for February 24, 1910.

² London, 1933, p. 326.

rock the baby. Crazed by fatigue and lack of sleep, she strangles the child and at once falls asleep.

The period of time covered by the action in Katherine Mansfield's story is slightly shorter: she begins in the early morning when the girl is aroused by a blow, while Chekhov begins during the preceding night with the girl's desperate efforts to stay awake. Both end the following night after the mistress's final command to rock the baby. But the likeness of the two stories does not end with the outline; the mood, and even much of the detail, are the same. At the crisis of both stories the girl's stupefied mind seizes with a feeling of great discovery upon the idea that it is the baby who prevents her sleeping. She thinks of strangling it; without any question or moral conflict, she laughs with pleasure at the thought; and when she has finished she lies happily down upon the floor and falls fast asleep. The action of the preceding day, the account of a servant girl's daily work, would naturally be much the same—splitting wood, lighting the oven, "heating" the coffee (or the samovar), washing the floor (or the steps), peeling potatoes—these details one would expect to find, and one does, in both. But there are others. In Chekhov's story there is a recurrent picture or motif which appears when the child in spite of herself has fallen asleep in the night and dreams of "a broad high road covered with liquid mud," with people and wagons, and tall hills on either side. This is repeated after she has been wakened by a "sharp slap behind the ear," and it recurs the next night before she thinks of killing the baby. Katherine Mansfield's story has a similar recurring motif introduced in the first sentence: "she was just beginning to walk along a little white road with tall black trees on either side . . . where nobody walked at all, when a hand gripped her shoulder, shook her, slapped her ear." This vision too recurs at the same points in the story, once soon after she has got up and again just before the crisis as well as at other moments during the day. The sensations of sleepiness and fatigue are on the whole rather different, but in both the child's neck aches, and objects seem to grow large before her eyes: in Chekhov's story it is the master's golosh which as she is cleaning it, "grows, swells and fills the whole room"; in "The Child-Who-Was-Tired" the man and his wife sitting at supper seemed to "swell to an immense size as she watched them, and then become smaller than dolls."

The day's work in both stories is prolonged by the arrival of visitors in the evening with further parallel commands to "set the samovar" and to "put on the coffee."

There are other rather minute likenesses; there are differences as well. The most important of the latter is one which shows the increasing tendency of the more modern writer toward concentration of time, scene, and interest. I have said that the Russian story begins earlier on the night before the crisis. The interval is occupied by the child's half-waking dreams of her early life, by means of which Chekhov gives us rather a complete picture of her past. In the story of Katherine Mansfield we are kept more strictly to the present scene, the child's past being suggested only by a few words of the mistress which she overhears.

The explanation that I suggest for the similarity, which amounts almost to a reproduction of the same story, is offered only tentatively. In spite of the very close parallel there was probably no deliberate plagiarism on the part of Katherine Mansfield. It seems unlikely, too, that, if she were experimenting to see what she could do with the same plot, she would have published it without acknowledgment. Only a less exigent egoism than hers would be likely to seek, or find, satisfaction by an accomplishment not really her own. It seems more probably a case of unconscious memory, a phenomenon common enough in matters of detail, though not common in such complete instances. This is, of course, only surmise. But the interpretation is somewhat strengthened by another resemblance which I think is not fanciful, though it is scarcely susceptible of definite proof, of one of Katherine Mansfield's later stories to a novel of Henry James. The fragment called "The Dove's Nest," which is about a girl named Milly, suggests, in something more subtle than its title and heroine's name, certain parts in the latter half of James's *The Wings of the Dove*. Something of the spirit—the color of the air, one might call it, in the two houses (one in the south of France, the other in Italy), the two women living in each of them—much in the heroine herself, and in the author's unspoken attitude toward her, a delicate, romanticized, veiled portrayal, though it is quite indefinable, seems distinctly similar. In this case a writer who was deliberately borrowing an atmosphere would hardly have taken care to point the indebtedness by the use of the reminiscent title and a heroine with

the same name. There is no similarity here of action or of situation, and the whole is typical of those vague, unconscious reminiscences of which literary history affords any number of examples. If I am right in drawing this parallel, the probability that the earlier story was an unconscious imitation of Chekhov is somewhat strengthened. One feature of a certain type of imaginative mind is the power of taking in that which appeals to it with so much activity of its own, so little of mere passive appreciation, that the memory afterward will seem to bear the stamp of its own imagination. Whether this interpretation is correct or not, the case itself is an interesting one—how interesting, only those who read the four stories together, and then read Katherine Mansfield's letters and Journal, can know.

ELISABETH SCHNEIDER

Temple University

REVIEWS

Luther's German Bible. An Historical Presentation together with a Collection of Sources by M. REU. Columbus, Ohio: The Lutheran Book Concern, 1934. xiv, 364, 226 pp., 14 plates. \$4.00.

The book is divided into two separately numbered parts, namely the Historical Presentation (pp. 1-364) and the Source Material (pp. 1*-217*). The chapter headings of the Historical Presentation give a general idea of its contents: I. The Bible in the Middle Ages; II. Luther and the Bible; III. Luther's Translation of the New Testament; IV. Luther's Translation of the Old Testament and the Complete Bible of 1534; V. Luther's Work on the Bible from 1534 till his death; VI. The distinctive characteristics of Luther's German Bible. These six chapters are followed by seventy-seven pages of notes, whose purpose is to document the statements made in the Historical Presentation.

The Source Material offers selections, in Latin, from Comestor's *Historia Scholastica*; and in German, from the Monsee Gospel, Notker, the Windberg Psalter, the *Wenzelbibel*, and other manuscripts, as well as from the printed Mentel Bible (ca. 1466), in part with the variants of the later editions, in part with the text of Zainer, Koburger, and Silvanus Otmar (1518) in parallel columns. These are followed by selections from the Low German Bibles, from the History Bibles, from the German Plenaries or

Pericopes, and from a number of German Psalters. The reader is thus enabled to compare Luther's translation, in quite a number of passages, with older German versions.

The Source Materials for Chapter II, from Luther's Lectures and Commentaries (on the Psalms, on Romans, on Hebrews, on Galatians) are given in English translation; for Chapters III-V there are selections from various translations of Luther, from 1517 to 1546, again in the original, whilst selected Prefaces of Luther (to the Psalter of 1531, to Romans of 1522) are again in English translation.

In his preface the author modestly disclaims "original researches" in the preparation of his book:

here the scattered source materials that were discovered and edited by others are made available in connected form. The author can truthfully claim that he has worked through all the available material, scattered as it is, down to the most recent publications of this year, and on the basis of this extensive literature presents the first comprehensive picture of the origin of Luther's German Bible. New as many of its conclusions are and often far removed from traditional views they nevertheless give the latest conclusions of historical science, even in the smallest details.

Instead of discussing all these details, let us take up one of the more important questions treated by Dr. Reu, namely that of Luther's use of earlier German translations. A brief summary of the conclusions of the various scholars that have dealt with the question is given on pages 352 and 353: the staunch Catholics among them usually conclude that Luther made extensive use of the earlier German Bible, while the staunch Protestants are sure that he was not acquainted with the older translations. The publication of the pre-Lutheran German translation, in the years 1904-1915, promoted intensive study of the question, and in 1922, in the *Sitzungsberichte* of the Berlin Academy, Gustav Roethe came to the following conclusion:

Für das N. T. ist die vorlutherische gedruckte Bibel in der Zeinerschen Redaction ausgiebig und regelmäßig herangezogen; doch wurde diese systematisch in Wortschatz und Syntax modernisiert. Besonders eng ist der Anschluß in der Apokalypse, freier in den Evangelien; besonders frei in den Paulinischen Briefen, wo im Interesse deutlicher Lehre viele tiefer eingreifende Neuübertragungen einsetzen. In zahlreichen Einzelstellen klingt Luthers N. T. auch an den Codex Teplensis an; hier werden aber nur Gedächtnisanlehnungen vorliegen. Das A. T. Luthers ist in Wortschatz, Syntax und Rhythmus reicher, zeigt erhöhten Kunststil und demgemäß eine bewußt altertümlichere Sprache.

The detailed proofs for these various statements, which Roethe promised to give later, seem never to have been published. After his death, D. theol. Alb. Freytag took up the task, in the *Sitzungsberichte* of the Berlin Academy of April 25, 1929, where he compares sixteen passages in the O. T.; his strongest passage is I. Sam. (I. Reg.) 2, 13, where *fuscina tridens* of the Vulgate, an exact rendition of the Hebrew, is given by Mentel and Zainer as *einen*

dreizügigen krewel, by Koburger as *einen dreyzenigen krewel*. In his first draft Luther has the word *dreytzungig*, which Freytag explains as a misreading of *dreizügig*. In other passages Luther, according to Freytag, agrees with Zainer, as against Mentel: therefore Zainer must have been the edition used by Luther. All of this is based on the single word *dreytzungig*, which is assumed not to occur in any other aids accessible to Luther.

In the Weimar edition of the Luther Bible (vi, 595-637) Freytag gives "Ergänzende Erläuterungen und Anmerkungen über Luthers Benutzung der deutschen Bibel des MA. (Zainerbibel) bei seiner Übersetzung des N. T. (Matthäus bis Apostelgeschichte)." His *Hauptbeweisstelle* concerns the translation of the Greek *χαίρε* or *χαίρετε*, Latin *Ave*, *Avete*, occurring at four places, namely Matth. 26, 49; 27, 29; 28, 9; Mark 15, 18. In all the editions from 1522 to 1527 Luther renders this one word by *gott grus dich*, or *got grusse euch*. As the identical translation is found in the pre-Lutheran Bibles from Mentel through the Zainer group, Freytag considers this as a striking proof that Luther used Zainer. He is aware of the fact that at least three glossaries of the fifteenth century have the same translation, and also remarks casually that Luther, in sermons of the years 1519-21, uses the forms: *Gegrusst seistw*, *Gehab dich wol*, *dw bist angnemb bey goth*, *Grueß dich Goth*, *Goth ist dir holdt*, *Got ist mit dir*. Nevertheless Freytag is convinced that Luther used Zainer in the above passages from Matthew and Mark, which constitute his *Hauptbeweisstelle*. I must confess that I do not see the cogency of his argument, which is accepted by Reu. If Luther, as early as 1519-1521, uses the phrase *Grueß dich Goth* in sermons, why should he have to go to Zainer in 1522 for such an idiomatic expression?

Elsewhere Reu usually follows Walther's *Deutsche Bibelübersetzung des Mittelalters* in his evaluation of the medieval translations. On page 22 we read that "The Zurich manuscript likewise possesses the prefaces to the four Gospels and these prefaces coincide with those in the first printed Bible, the Mentel Bible." The uninitiated might assume from this that the text of the Zurich MS is identical with that of Mentel: this is not the case, and Walther (col. 488) is very specific in his statement: only the Latin from which the two texts descend is identical in content, the translations themselves are entirely different. On page 7 Reu speaks of the National Library in Vienna, and also on page 23, whereas on page 20 the Monsee MS is assigned to the Vienna Hofbibliothek; similar references are found on p. 296, as well as Plate I: he does not know that the Hofbibliothek of the old régime is now the Nationalbibliothek. The Monsee MS, by the way, was edited by George Allison Hench, not George Allison, as Reu states on page 300. It would be interesting to know where Reu gets his authority for the statement (p. 67): "Charlemagne . . . must have had some connection with the prepa-

ration of that Bible of which a fragment has been preserved in the 'Monseer Matthaeus.' On page 25 Reu mentions MSS at Mainingen, Nuremberg, and elsewhere, but fails to note the earliest MS of this group, of the year of 1436, in the British Museum, because this is not mentioned by Walther. The second part of Vollmer's work, mentioned on page 52, actually appeared in the summer of 1933, and was followed in the summer of 1934 by still another instalment: *Verdeutschung der Paulinischen Briefe von den ersten Anfängen bis Luther. Beiträge zu ihrer Geschichte mit neuen Texten, synoptischen Tabellen und 3 Bildtafeln hrsg. in Gemeinschaft mit Fritz Jülicher, Willy Lüdtke und Richard Newald von Hans Vollmer.*

In his preface (p. ix) Reu informs us that his book was written in German and translated into English by several friends. To this fact are doubtless due readings such as: *the Sorger Bible* (p. 33) instead of *the Sorg Bible*; *Neither Pietsch nor Maurer . . . have entered* (p. 47); *the Freisinger Bishop* (p. 68) instead of *the Bishop of Freising*; *M. Philippum, Mattheum Aurogallum* (p. 212) instead of *M. Philippus, Mattheus Aurogallus*; *see in the Neuen deutschen Bibel* (p. 235); *To this aufs neue zugerichteten Bible* (p. 239); *foreign printers* (p. 239) meaning *printers outside of Wittenberg*; *much untenable opinions have been voiced* (p. 345); *hand copy* (p. 359) a translation of the German *Handexemplar*.

There is a superabundance of misprints, particularly in foreign names and texts: for example, *Monse* (p. 20) for *Monsee*; *Retlev* (p. 23) for *Rotlev*; *Thueringians, Thueringia* (pp. 138 ff.); *Sachsenhausen* (p. 142) for *Sachsenhausen*; *Hehrew* (p. 197); *Liebharer* (p. 277); *Balileae* (p. 289) for *Basileae*; *Migné* (p. 292) for *Migne*; *Hingden* (p. 293) for *Higden*; *Francaise, moyan age, francaise, Jahrhundertrts* on the same page; *Osterreich* (p. 296); *Prebisch* (p. 300) for *Priebsch*; *ausfürlichem* (p. 300); *E. Wolfe* (p. 330) as against *E. Wolf* (p. 331); *handschriftlichen* (p. 332); *Christium* (p. 334) for *Christum*; *Abenlandes* (p. 337); *Iduicium* (p. 339) for *Iudicium*; *Schriftsprinzips* (p. 345); *Dobschuctz* (p. 349) for *Dobschütz*; *terniores* (p. 355) for *terniones*; *Assonaz* (p. 363) for *Assonanz*; *urzgiton* (p. 10*) for *uragiton*; *sie wip* (ib.) for *sin wip*; *suhstuole* (p. 11*) for *suhtstuole*; *zeflinzzet* (ib.) for *zefliuzzet*; *none dem* (ib.) for *uone dem*; *Faust-Schoepper* (p. 220*) for *Faust-Schoeffer*.

This formidable list of shortcomings would no doubt be augmented by close reading of the source material, of which I have tested only a few random passages. The book, nevertheless, should prove stimulating to the general reader, for whom it is primarily intended, and the wealth of material given in the notes will be useful also to the serious student.

W. KURRELMMEYER

Magistri Eckardi Opera Latina. Auspiciis Institutii Sanctae Sabinae ad codicum fidem edita. I. Super Oratione Dominica. Edidit RAYMUNDUS KLIBANSKY. Leipzig: Felix Meiner, 1934. RM. 2.50. Complete edition estimated at RM. 80.

Meister Eckhart's German works were rediscovered about a century ago, and, although a reliable critical edition is not yet available, they are not as completely inaccessible as his writings in Latin. The latter, however, are of extreme importance for the understanding of Eckhart and the spiritual situation of his time. They reveal that the current picture of the enthusiastic Medieval mystic has to be supplemented by that of a rational thinker. Whereas the ideas of Thomas Aquinas and Dante find their climax in a mystic immersion in God, Eckhart's mysticism is founded on an under-structure of philosophic-theological thinking in the scholastic fashion. This first issue of Eckhart's Latin writings, which in addition to a general introduction to the history and tradition of Eckhart's works contains his comments on the Lord's Prayer, gives a good idea of the subtle art of analytical interpretation and the industrious compilation of the Medieval monk, although it is only one of his minor Latin writings.

The text of the manuscript is supplemented and emended with the help of quotations and plagiarisms of later writers, especially those of Jordanus of Quedlinburg. In the very extensive critical apparatus, the most important variants are given. It also contains passages from other works of the author which may serve to clarify the idea presented. The source material is not limited in the strictly philological sense to evident borrowings from other authors, but is meant to serve the purpose of placing Eckhart in his proper intellectual environment. The apparatus finally offers testimonies, quotations and annotations of later Medieval authors, especially the valuable comments of Nicolaus Cusanus. This carefully prepared and extremely rich edition of Eckhart's Latin writings promises to become an important contribution to the study of Medievalism and the basis for further fruitful research.

The edition is prepared under the auspices of the *Institutum Sanctae Sabinae* of the Dominican Order in Rome. It is the result of years of research and embodies two independent studies, one by Father Gabriel Théry and the other by Raymond Klibansky, a collaborator of the Heidelberg Cusanus edition. Strange to say, another edition of the great mystic, which is to include his German works also, has just been planned by German Eckhart scholars, and a somewhat peculiarly worded announcement of it in the issue of *Geistige Arbeit* of Nov. 5, 1934 makes one surmise that this highly regrettable waste of scholarly energy is to be attributed to a nationalistic refusal to cooperate with foreign scholars. In the interest of scholastic achievement we hope that this will remain an

isolated example of national seclusion, although our hopes have lately been exposed to very severe shocks.

F. W. KAUFMANN

Smith College

Milton's Blindness. By ELEANOR GERTRUDE BROWN. New York: Columbia University Press, 1934. Pp. 170.

Much has been written about Milton's affliction, but in this instance the author, like Milton, had bid her "eyes take holiday"; and she says in her brief preface: "On account of this bond of union, I bring to the task an interest such as Milton must have given to the writing of *Samson Agonistes*. Thus, by similarity of experience alone, I am rendered a more able critic." This little volume of 167 pages is divided into four parts: The Cause of Milton's Blindness, Autobiographical References to his Blindness, Milton as Reflected in His Poetry, and Milton's "Eyes take Holiday."

The first chapter of Part I is devoted to the description of the inadequacy of Medicine and Hygiene during the 17th Century. The following five chapters contain successively, consideration of the fantastic, improbable, and possible causes of Milton's blindness. The author concludes that either glaucoma or nearsight with detachment of the retina may have been responsible. Four chapters of Part II contain autobiographical references to Milton's affliction. Part III discusses Milton as reflected in his poetry. Part IV deals with the various aspects of Milton's blindness, and gives the most interesting analysis of the effect of blindness upon the man, his character and his writings, by one who is herself blind. This part also includes graphic descriptions of loss of sight—quoted from distinguished blind writers. The author concludes, "that Milton's blindness affected his life and poetry spiritually and philosophically. It increased his power of concentration and the acuteness of his auditory and olfactory senses; but it was not responsible for the selection of visual images in his later poetry, and did not determine his painting on a vast scale, his choice of luminous and color adjectives, nor his forgetting of certain flowers."

The final chapter is given up to the consideration of the praise and dispraise heaped upon Milton. The author says: "Perhaps no poet of the English language has received less dispraise than Milton." However, certain it is that some of his contemporaneous critics, such as Salmasius, developed the art of invective and abuse to a high degree of controversial efficiency. On the other hand, of few great men have there been spoken or written so many beautiful eulogies as of Milton.

The author concludes with the very consoling thought that all the handicapped must "find in affliction the blessing which alone makes its endurance possible; but, like Milton, learn to believe that 'They also serve who only stand and wait.'" Thus very sympathetically does Miss Brown, searching through the records of the multi-minded poet, pluck a nettle here and there, and in its place plant a flower.

WILLIAM H. WILMER

*Wilmer Ophthalmological Institute,
The Johns Hopkins University*

Peter Anthony Motteux, 1663-1718: A Biographical and Critical Study. By ROBERT NEWTON CUNNINGHAM. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1933. Pp. 217.

Although Motteux is only a minor luminary in English literature, he is an undeniably interesting one. As Mr. Cunningham notes, he is remembered to-day only for his translations of Rabelais and Cervantes. But in the course of a varied literary career he did noteworthy work also in journalism, the novel, the drama, and the opera. When we remember that he came to England as a refugee at the age of twenty-two, we have reason to admire his skill in the language of his adopted land, especially his mastery of the current colloquialism which the modern reader finds so amusingly racy, although it was stylistically below the level of the best prose of the time, the prose of Dryden, Addison, and Swift.

This little volume on the life and works of Motteux is therefore welcome. The author has painstakingly gathered the facts and presented them in a straightforward manner, without either fictional elaboration or hero-worship. Nevertheless, he might have indulged in a little more art; he does not succeed in evoking for us the personality he writes about, and Motteux' place in literature remains vague even at the end of the book.

When he turns to sketching—all too slightly—the background for Motteux, Mr. Cunningham is insecure and sometimes slips into infelicitous statements. For instance, there is a curious remark that the "very existence" of Motteux' prologues and epilogues "demonstrates also that the tradition of prologue and epilogue had become firmly established" (p. 108); but we have read Dryden's prologues, at least, and find the demonstration superfluous. Motteux' "Prologue to Her Royal Highness" (1696) could not have been addressed "to the Queen" (p. 109), who had died in 1694, but must obviously have been for Princess Anne. Much more important is the confusion evident in some remarks on sentimentalism

(p. 119). Mr. Cunningham seems to imply that moral purpose, as such, has been identified by many critics with sentimentalism, and he cites *The Rape of the Lock* as evidence that an "explicit moralist" may also be acclaimed as an artist. But the ethical implications of sentimentalism, and the effect of sentimentalism on comedy and tragedy, are subjects not so easily disposed of as that; they demand more protracted study. Mr. Cunningham's informative volume might have been more illuminating had he devoted more attention to such aspects of literary history.

LOUIS I. BREDVOLD

University of Michigan

The Plot and its Construction in Eighteenth Century Criticism of French Comedy. A Study of Theory with Relation to the Practice of Beaumarchais. By EDNA C. FREDRICK. Bryn Mawr: 1934. Pp. 129.

Here is a book that throws new light on two problems confronting the student of French comedy. One is the development of dramatic technique that turned *L'École des femmes* into *Le Barbier de Séville*. The other is the origin of the *pièce bien faite*. Linking the two there is obviously Beaumarchais, whose importance has generally been estimated hitherto somewhat as follows: "Beaumarchais, in the eighteenth century, was the first to conceive of comedy as a dramatic genre worthy and capable of technical excellence";¹ or again: "After Beaumarchais (who first constructed a complex and, at the same time, compact plot, nervous, brilliant and bustling), Scribe . . . utilized and developed this law of stage motion discovered by Beaumarchais."² Thus Beaumarchais is conceived as revolutionizing the construction of comedy by a *tour de force* of his unique genius. All too often no credit is given that other original genius, Diderot, whom Beaumarchais recognized as his master and whose theories are embodied in Beaumarchais' plays.

Not only does Miss Fredrick show, in an admirably clear analysis of Diderot's *Entretiens* and *De l'art dramatique* and the prefaces and plays of Beaumarchais, that Diderot developed and Beaumarchais put into practice the theories of plot construction which were to filter through the next forty years into nineteenth century comedy. She also undertakes to prove that Diderot's dramatic treatises and *Le Barbier de Séville* mark the culmination

¹ N. C. Arvin, *Eugène Scribe and the French Theatre 1815-1860*, Cambridge, Harvard University Press, 1924, p. 74.

² *Ibid.*, p. 172. (Italics mine.)

rather than the beginning of a new conception of comedy. From the earliest years of the century, writers who were unable themselves to turn out first class plays began to criticize and theorize, foreseeing that comedy was doomed unless in some way interest could be added to the sterile imitations of Molière. There were attempts at innovation, but Marivaux' psychological studies lacked action and plot; in the *comédie larmoyante* the complicated series of mistaken identities and misunderstandings necessitated too much exposition and left too little time for action; neither the episodic *comédie à tiroirs* nor the loosely constructed scenarios of the Théâtre-Italien and the Opéra-Comique satisfied a protesting spirit that finally led such playwrights as Riccoboni and Des-touches to declare that, while the classical *comédie de caractère* was still the ideal, plot was just as important as the study of character. It is not such a startling step to Diderot's famous dictum that the conditions should determine the characters. With his amazing gift for assimilating the ideas in the air about him, and molding them into memorable and significant form, Diderot passed on to Beaumarchais and to later generations the belief that in a successful comedy *forme* should receive more attention than *fond*.

Miss Fredrick has done a solid and stimulating piece of work, which the reader compliments by regretting that she did not enlarge its scope to include the years between Beaumarchais and Scribe. She says of the evolution of comedy after Beaumarchais only that it had "gained sufficient momentum to be carried along by its own force until the advent of Scribe," (p. 2)—a statement which seems to disregard the turbulent events of that rather long interval, when the normal development of comedy was interrupted by the demand for propaganda during the Revolution and by the classical revival of the Empire.

EDITH MELCHER

Wellesley College

Englische Sprachphilosophie im späteren 18. Jahrhundert von OTTO FUNKE. Inhalt: I. Von J. Harris bis Lord Monboddo. II. Horne Tooke als Sprachphilosoph. Bern: Francke, 1934. Pp. 162.

In his new book the Professor of English in the University of Berne has given us an account of English linguistic theories in the second half of the eighteenth century. Part of the ground was already covered by an essay on the theoretical views of J. Harris published in the author's *Studien zur Geschichte der Sprachphilosophie* (Berne, 1928), but the present volume aims at giving a coherent survey of the whole field, tracing the ups and downs of two philosophical currents—a rationalism usually coupled with a ten-

dency towards materialism and an idealism embodying much of the substance of what a little later developed into Romanticism. The former trend is illustrated by the theories of J. Priestley and A. Smith, whereas the two principal representatives of the latter are J. Harris and Lord Monboddo, both of whom owe a great deal to classical antiquity. They emphasize the spiritual elements of language and delight in its aesthetic qualities—the latter feature being shared by Adam Smith to the point of giving an unexpected irrational turn to his rationalistic speculations on the nature and value of language. Comparatively much space is allotted to the views of the Frenchman De Brosses, which seem to have had a considerable influence on the philological theories of J. Horne Tooke, that staunch supporter of the cause of rationalism and in some respects the most interesting and original of the figures dealt with in Professor Funke's essay. The author gives a detailed account of his chief philological work, *The Diversions of Purley*, bringing out in vivid relief Horne Tooke's one-sided, almost maniacal, insistence on his own perverse theories as well as the great merits of his historical investigation of the concrete material of his native language. Professor Funke has succeeded in imparting an almost dramatic quality to his treatment of the struggle of different principles in the wrong-headed but remarkable work of this last of the champions of eighteenth century "enlightenment" that are discussed in this book.

The author's own point of view comes out in his critical observations on the theorists dealt with. He does not confine himself to expounding their views and showing their position in the general development of philological thought but often drops interesting remarks as to the ultimate validity of their ideas. As a pupil of the late Professor A. Marty, he refrains from those vague metaphysical speculations that mar the work of many of his continental contemporaries and colleagues. His method is empirical and his point of view psychological in the best sense of the word. Some of Professor Marty's concepts—particularly that of the "figürliche innere Sprachform"—are constantly made use of in Professor Funke's evaluations of eighteenth-century digressions from the path of truth.

The style of the book is clear and fairly lively. We are not lost in a welter of detail but are provided with definite philosophical criteria, feeling at the same time that the philosophy is that of a trained philologist whose views are based on a real knowledge of facts.

University of Tartu, Estonia

ANTS ORAS

George Gissing and his Critic, Frank Swinnerton. By RUTH CAPERS MCKAY. Pp. 112. *George Meredith and Thomas Love Peacock: A Study in Literary Influence.* By AUGUSTUS HENRY ABLE, 3RD. Pp. 140. University of Pennsylvania doctoral theses, privately printed, 1933. *The Aesthetics of William Hazlitt: A Study of the Philosophical Basis of his Criticism.* By ELISABETH SCHNEIDER. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1933. Pp. viii + 200. \$2.00.

Tracing Gissing's influence on Swinnerton and defending the teacher against the pupil, Doctor McKay's long essay derives in large part from a fundamental illiberality in reading Swinnerton (and involves, too, pp. 40 ff., a superficiality in reading Meredith). In contrast to the literary historian, the sound critic like Swinnerton often has to treat an author from a single point of view which, because of its singleness, sometimes over- or under-states complicated matters. Such critical readings are tests by which works qualify as classics from age to age. One requires of the critic only that he be consistent in his viewpoint and that he do no violence without showing good cause to the established standing of his author. Swinnerton portrayed Gissing suitably and consistently as an egoistic failure. He did no violence to an established reputation, for he implied greatness by writing a book about Gissing and said finally no more than is true, that Gissing was a great second-rater, a failure beside first-raters like Meredith, Dickens, or Hardy. No amount of rhapsodizing recommended by Doctor McKay is likely to alter this estimate.

Doctor Able's study of Peacock and Meredith is more stimulating and to the point. To be sure, one rebels against the extent of influence Peacock is said to have had on Meredith because one knows Meredith for an individualist and one knows that parallels may derive from at least three sources: (1) direct influence from one person to another; (2) responses to *zeitgeist*, contemporary problems, similar social impulses; and (3) responses to timeless circumstances, traditions, temperaments or points of view. Shelley and Keats, for example, have much in common, not because one borrowed from the other, but because they were contemporaries, approached similar problems, and were never entirely outside the Platonic tradition in solving them. Meredith and Peacock, similarly, belonged to one caste, and met similar social problems. They both adopted a comic point of view. If they had not known each other, therefore, one would still expect to find parallels between their works as well as parallels to the works of others likewise dominated by the Comic Spirit, from Lucian, Erasmus, Jonson, Fielding, and even Carlyle to James Barrie or James Stephens. Peacock's main function in Meredith's life was probably only that

of helping a point of view to crystallize. As for making the Comic Spirit a Muse or Divinity—after all, it sat with Lucian on the orb of the moon overlooking Vanity Fair or the *comédie humaine* or the tragic comedy or whatever one wants to call the human show. Yet though Doctor Able's study lacks this background, it is suggestive and informative, especially in Chapters III and IV, "An Aspect of the Comic Spirit" and "Sentimentalism and its Cure."

The process of making a philosopher out of a good critic has precedent no doubt, but it becomes slightly ridiculous when it leads Doctor Schneider to rank Hazlitt as philosopher above Coleridge, Johnson, Carlyle, Arnold, Ruskin, Pater, and others, though she insists at the same time that Hazlitt distrusted philosophical systems and was an opportunistic, somewhat Menckonian critic, not creative. Doctor Schneider's book, nevertheless, is a valuable addition to Hazlitt scholarship. It is mature. Its author has a humanist's knack for detecting connections between ideas and arriving at unities. In her book one can readily find the common notions of Hazlitt on aesthetic matters, stimulating comparisons between him and Coleridge or Schiller, and finally a list of Hazlitt's readings in philosophy. Somehow, in spite of her thesis, a picture emerges of Hazlitt as a critic whose views have a kind of consistency, not because he was a logician, but because they were strained through a single creature, Hazlitt, who was fairly up in aesthetics, who was at his best in illuminating works as they came before him and stimulated him, and whose criticisms therefore had something of the mellowing and spiriting effect of aging literature in a vigorous, distinguished individuality.

ARTHUR E. DUBOIS

Duquesne University

Walt Whitman in England. By HAROLD BLODGETT. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1934. Pp. ix + 234. (Cornell Studies in English, XXIV.)

Walt Whitman. By FLOYD STOVALL. New York: American Book Company, 1934. Pp. lxiii + 426. (American Writers Series.)

Mr. Blodgett's *Walt Whitman in England* is a study of the interest in Whitman which developed in the British Isles before the poet's death in 1892, arranged "according to the various Englishmen who responded actively to *Leaves of Grass*." Naturally those who responded most actively were Whitman's defenders; and, accordingly, this study tends to stress the favorable interest rather than the unfavorable, leaving the impression that the response to *Leaves of Grass* was predominantly generous and understanding.

The facts given show that this was not altogether true, but their presentation would have been clearer had the concluding chapter been a chronological survey of the attitudes displayed toward Whitman's successive publications. It is to be hoped that the author will take advantage of his unique command of a large body of interesting material and publish an additional essay concerned primarily with the criticism not associated with outstanding individuals. Except for the omission of something of this sort, Mr. Blodgett's survey seems admirably thorough. It is instructive and readable, and it will serve future students as an invaluable descriptive bibliography of the most important English contemporary comment on Whitman. An extensive formal bibliography including numerous periodical articles not elsewhere listed is included in the volume, but it is not complete and may be supplemented from *Poole's Index*.

A few minor errors survived proof reading: the reference to Grindrod as a Civil War veteran in 1856 (p. 16); the application of "until recently no one" to the facts given (p. 154); and the misprint of 1892 for 1882 as the date of Ellis's "Two Worlds" essay (p. 209). In the bibliography, xlii, 176-176, for xlviii, 170-176 (p. 233, Swinbune's "Whitmania") and xlii for xlviii (p. 233, Symonds' reply).

Mr. Stovall's book is an anthology of selections from Whitman's poetry and prose with brief notes; a chronological table; a selected bibliography; and an introduction giving a concise account of his background, life, and work, and an exposition of his theory of poetry and principal lines of thought. The editor's work appears careful and his ideas sound, but the expository portion of the introduction has two serious faults. In the first place, parts of it are written in a style almost as inflated and difficult as Whitman's own and consequently are of doubtful value to the beginning student for whom they are intended. In the second, its tone and mechanics of reference are those of an essay defending an interpretation rather than those of an introduction to a particular body of selections. Since the interpretation is not new, this volume is of little interest to advanced students; nor is it a wholly satisfactory text for beginners.

LEON HOWARD

Pomona College

Patmore: a Study in Poetry. By FREDERICK PAGE. [N. Y. and] London: Oxford University Press. 1933. Pp. 184. \$2.25.

Mr. Page has been for more than twenty years a student of his subject, and is already known by valuable selections from Patmore's unprinted periodical essays (*Courage in Politics*, etc., with a

complete bibliography, 1921). Mr. Osbert Burdett's *Idea of Coventry Patmore* (1921) provided only a substitute for acquaintance with the system implicit in the poems, but Mr. Page now vindicates their visionary mood afresh for the reader from a closer familiarity with both Patmore's life and times and with his prose works and unpublished notebooks. His main task is professedly to determine the value of *The Angel in the House* and the earlier poems and of the metrical theory involved in *The Unknown Eros*, and incidentally to decide whether Patmore's 'nobly wild' mysticism deserves recognition from something more than 'a Roman Catholic coterie.' The book is uncritical, occupied rather with the poet's aims than his performance, but its riches will be essential to further investigators.

Without detailed aesthetic criticism one is surprised to hear in the course of only three pages (14-16) that Patmore captures (in isolated lines) the *note* of Milton, Pope, Wordsworth, Shelley, Keats, Tennyson, Arnold or Swinburne, and that as a man of letters he has frequently 'the advantage over' Milton, Johnson, Scott, Wordsworth, Lamb or Carlyle. Allusion, which is all that Mr. Page pretends to, is not criticism, and it becomes preposterous when he makes small difference between Patmore's absorption, as a 'disciple,' in the established orders of Victorian society and of Roman theology, and the poetical aims of the two 'heresiarchs' whom he most often invokes as 'disciples' for comparison, namely Dante and Wordsworth. The 'capacity of elaborate social beauty' of Patmore's feminine divinity is not comparable with the spirit of philosophical poems conceived in ages when a more virile social and political philosophy was in the air.

Chronological arrangement gives Mr. Page the felicitous use of his biographical and historical facts, but he has no criteria for poetry beyond Patmore's own principles, wilfully applied in season and out of season to special cases. The accounting for the sources of *The Angel in the House* is skilful and original; in the end (pp. 79-80) they are not much more than comparisons. *The Unknown Eros* is again the occasion for really good literary investigation, but to regard the sexual mysticism of the author of the *Sponsa Dei* as mystical theology, even if the converse must so often be true, is hardly necessary at this date. Patmore's theological spirit lusts far too often against the poet's flesh, and Mr. Page is elsewhere only too zealous to talk boldly about 'sensuality' and ardour for 'the visible world' (pp. 26, 61, 174-8). His original and stimulating account of *The Marriage of the Blessed Virgin* (extant only in MS. notes) describes 'perfect humanity, verging upon, but never entering, the breathless region of Divinity.' The poet must here, as often in this exposition, remain the property of his coreligionists rather than of literary criticism: he believed as his critic does that 'true poetry and true theological science have to do with one and the same ideal.'

The discussion of the theory and practice of Patmore's irregular ode deals primarily with the element of pause (which he held to be a chief subject of metrical law), with the rightness of the 'dipode' as a unit of verse and with 'that artistic consciousness to the expression of which Hegel traces the very life of metre.' Mr. Page 'discovers the Time of each word by the sense of Passion,' and it is only unfortunate that his tentative transcription in tonic sol-fa notation should falsify the poet's intention. There is a curious piece of logic on pp. 156-7 in a passage already revealing the author's inaptitude for aesthetic exegesis. His overgenerous championship cannot settle Patmore's reputation. There is still need for an historical elucidation of the devout regard which Patmore had for poetry (with such a background of contemporary thought as Mr. Page begins to trace in his account of 'the poem of the age' that Patmore was to have written) and for a more complete alignment of his mature poetry, by its elliptical conceits and emotional rhetoric, with the technique of the Metaphysicals.

Princeton, New Jersey

OWEN E. HOLLOWAY

Letters to the New Island. By WILLIAM BUTLER YEATS. Edited by HORACE REYNOLDS. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1934. Pp. xvi + 222. \$2.50.

This book is an important contribution to the history of the Irish Renaissance, for it throws new light upon the origin and development of the ideas of its founder and chief poet. Mr. Horace Reynolds has discovered in the files of the *Boston Pilot* and the *Providence Journal* nineteen articles long forgotten even by the writer himself, which Yeats wrote between 1888 and 1892 to inform American readers about the beginnings of the literary revival in Ireland.

The most remarkable aspect of these essays is their prophetic character. As Yeats says in a prefatory note, they show that "I had in later life worked out with the excitement of discovery things known in my youth as though one forgot and rediscovered oneself." Again and again we come upon beacons to direct the progress of the movement ten years before the Irish Dramatic Movement began. "With Irish literature and Irish thought alone I have to do." "From that great candle of the past we must all light our little tapers." "England is old and her poets must scrape up the crumbs of an almost finished banquet, but Ireland has still full tables." "If we can but put those tumultuous centuries into tale or drama, the whole world will listen to us and sit at our feet like children who hear a new story."

In an illuminating Introduction Mr. Reynolds discusses with thoroughness the five major beliefs which the young Yeats an-

nounced as his programme: (1) An Irish writer should be national and write of Irish life, (2) The treasury of Irish legend should be unlocked for Irish reader and writer alike, (3) Irish poetry must be purged of politics, (4) The study of the occult would free man from the despotism of unhappiness, (5) After Ireland had an imaginative literature she would be ripe for a national theatre.

Mr. Reynolds has done a great service in making these articles available and in explaining their significance so brilliantly. Yeats writes, "These essays, which I have not seen for years, fill me with curiosity." That is the feeling of all readers interested in the Celtic Revival who open this volume.

F. W. C. HERSEY

Harvard University

BRIEF MENTION

Les Romantiques français et la Musique. Par RAYMOND LESLIE EVANS. Paris: Champion, 1934. Pp. xiii + 184. Après le petit livre vivant et senti de M. Baldensperger, *Sensibilité musicale et Romantisme* (Paris, 1925), voici une étude plus ambitieuse d'apparence, mais qui est encore loin d'être définitive. L'auteur a fort bien vu les principales divisions du sujet, il a tracé des cadres plausibles, mais sa documentation paraît trop courte et trop souvent de seconde main. Les quelques pages consacrées à George Sand qu'il aurait autant valu ne pas qualifier de "géante à forme de Titan" sont manifestement insuffisantes (pp. 66-74), et nous aurions voulu voir l'historien suivre de plus près l'admiratrice de Liszt et l'amie de Chopin "à travers ses romans musicaux," qui sont seulement énumérés et trop brièvement caractérisés. Plus graves encore sont les lacunes que l'on pourrait relever dans l'étude sur Balzac (pp. 74-85). Après M. Rouchès et M. Bellaigue, M. Evans s'est attaché surtout à *Gambara* et à *Massimilla Doni*. Mais comment parler du culte de Balzac pour Beethoven sans mentionner au moins la page prestigieuse par laquelle se termine *César Birotteau*, et comment peut-on oublier le bon Schmucke, l'ami du *Cousin Pons*? La seconde partie du travail de M. Evans est plus neuve et plus fouillée. On lira avec intérêt les courts chapitres sur le "primitivisme" musical qu'après M. Baldensperger il a relevé chez Madame de Staël, Chateaubriand, Balzac, Gérard de Nerval et George Sand. L'auteur a justement noté que ce primitivisme est aussi un exotisme et que les romantiques ont recherché les barcaroles des gondoliers, les chants du Tyrol autant que les chants des paysans de France. Goût de l'exotisme et en particulier de l'italianisme, des virtuoses du chant et du piano, recherche d'une émotion musicale qui fait rêver, secoue et fait vibrer les nerfs et

dont l'appel est sensuel, confusion extrême des arts, et aspiration plus ou moins raisonnée vers un art complet qui combinerait à la fois la pensée, la forme, la couleur et les sons, telles sont les aspirations, les ambitions qui semblent avoir troublé et inquiété les romantiques. Il n'en est pas moins vrai que par instants, certains, et Balzac est de ceux-là, comme le montre très justement M. Evans, ont eu l'idée d'un art où il n'y aurait "ni figures ni sentiments" et qui serait de l'art pur, ou plutôt de la musique pure.

GILBERT CHINARD

Contes de fées du Grand Siècle. Par MARY ELIZABETH STORER. New York: Publications of the Institute of French Studies, 1934. Pp. 182. \$1.75. This is an edition of nine fairy-tales composed at the end of the seventeenth century, or early in the eighteenth, by Mme d'Aulnoy (*Mouton, Grenouille bienfaisante*), Catherine Bernard (*Riquet à la houppe*), Mme de Murat (*Palais de la vengeance, Fée princesse, Peine perdue*), Mlle de la Force (*Vert et bleu, Persinette*), and the Chevalier de Mailly (*la Reine de l'île des Fleurs*). *La Fée princesse* and *Peine perdue* had not previously been published. The texts seem to have been carefully reproduced and are accompanied by a short account of the *genre* and by notices of the authors. The only misprint that may mislead a reader is 1687, apparently for 1697, on p. 77. The author raises the question as to whether *Riquet à la houppe* is by Mlle Bernard or Eustache Le Noble. Her argument is well presented, but I do not find any justification for her assigning the tale to both of them, however equable this may seem. It would have been well to point out on p. 8 that Mother Goose had been already mentioned by Régnier; to indicate as a partial source for *le Mouton* the *Innocence reconnue*¹ of Cériziers; and to mention the fact that the cure for blindness in *Persinette* had appeared in *l'Aveugle de Smyrne*. These are minor details that detract little from the usefulness of this pleasing volume, which will be of interest to all concerned with the history of modern *contes*.

H. C. L.

The Themes of Magic in Nineteenth Century French Fiction. By EMILE CAILLIET. English translation by Lorraine Havens. Paris: Les Presses Universitaires de France, 1932. Pp. 229. 40 fr. Few men possess the qualifications for writing such a book as

¹ In both stories a woman is condemned to death, sent into a forest, and set free; a dog's tongue is shown as a substitute for hers in order to make it appear that she has been killed; she is assisted by sympathetic animals and finally restored to her home. The story goes back to the Middle Ages, but Cériziers's account of it is nearest to that of Mme d'Aulnoy and was easily accessible, for *l'Innocence reconnue* passed through at least five editions in the seventeenth century.

this. The task requires not merely a knowledge of the fiction under discussion, but an understanding as well of strange aspects of humanity, an understanding based upon close acquaintance with the primitive mind. Dr. Cailliet, Professor of French Literature and Civilization in Scripps College, has for many years delved deeply into the history of the primitive and the occult. In 1926 he went to Madagascar to pursue a social study of the natives. He lived among them, acquired their languages, became acquainted at first hand with their mental processes. Upon a second visit he was awarded the official "Brevet" of Malagasy dialects.

To the study of literature he brings, therefore, the mind of a scientist and a philosopher. His extensive learning and his kindly tolerance illuminate that portion of French fiction of the nineteenth century which concerns itself with magic. "It is one of our firmest convictions," he writes in the preface, "that literary criticism, having already become enriched by contact with many scientific disciplines, may find a source of new possibilities in the teachings of contemporary ethnology." In the spirit of this conviction he discusses in turn (1) the tradition of the popular novel and the *genre* of terror, (2) the *merveilleux* in fairy tales and short stories of wonder, (3) magic of the past and the historical novel, (4) occultism and the philosophical novel, (5) the novel of the supernatural from animal magnetism to modern spiritualism, (6) the metamorphoses of the Devil in the nineteenth century and Huysmans's satanism, (7) sorcery among the peasants and the novel of country life, and finally (8) magic among the "savages" and the exotic novel. He makes clear that, only since scientific knowledge of the primitive mind has made possible faithful treatment, have the various themes of magic been capable of development into literary masterpieces. He has isolated the themes, shown why they have become popular, and furnished a background for a proper understanding and appreciation of such fiction. He has, indeed, provided an adequate foundation for further study in this field. The English translation, while clear, does not always rise above the influence of the French idiom.

WALDO H. DUNN

College of Wooster

The Congo, Parts 1 and 2; Part 3, and Kansas; John L. Sullivan. By VACHEL LINDSAY. Columbia University Phonograph Records, Nos. 1, 2, 3. New York: Columbia University Press, 1933. \$.75 for each record; \$2.00 for the set of three. In the introduction to the *Selected Poems*, published early in 1931, I said that "phonograph records of every poem in this book, exactly as Mr. Lindsay chants it, ought to be made and be made at once." A few weeks later the poet walked into the speech

laboratory of Professor Cabell Greet, who rose magnificently to a great opportunity; and more than half the poems of that volume were recorded. Before the year was out the singer was dead. In the library of Columbia University now reposes a complete set of the master records. Public response to the first three issues will, it is hoped, warrant speedy publication of the rest; since, if I may quote again from the same essay, "for most of us the melodic phrases of 'The Chinese Nightingale' never rise from the cold type. One must hear the poet himself if one is to appreciate the ravishing beauty and variety of its patterns." The importance, therefore, to our national art of the enlightened action of Mr. Greet and the Columbia Press is obvious, whether or not one is prepared to accept Mr. Edgar Lee Masters's recent appraisal of Lindsay's best work as "the largest body of inspired lyricism that any American has contributed." As for the quality of these first records, they are made of a flexible composition, which can be manufactured cheaply. They are a little scratchy, and those who are not well acquainted with Lindsay's poetry will need to hold the book for the first few playings. But the voice and, more surprisingly, the vibrant personality come through superbly. The vocal orchestration of "The Congo" surpasses any performance I heard directly. "Kansas," that fine lyric of the wheat harvest, was well chosen to illustrate the non-rhetorical side of Lindsay's art. "John L. Sullivan" is a good example of his less serious vein and, even within itself, of the wonderfully wide range that ran the whole gamut from tenderness to giant humor.

H. S.

Thomas Digges, the Copernican System, and the Idea of the Infinity of the Universe in 1576. By FRANCIS R. JOHNSON and SANFORD V. LARKEY. *Huntington Library Bulletin*, No. 5, April 1934, pp. 69-117. As hitherto disregarded but significant evidence for Digges' prominence in the history of ideas and of cosmological theories especially in England, the authors present a reduced facsimile of Digges' diagram of the universe on the Copernican System together with a reprint (pp. 79-95) of that part of the rare 1576 edition of his *Prognostication Everlasting* in which Digges upholds that system. The article makes clear Digges' priority over Giordano Bruno in developing in England the idea of an infinite universe and in supporting this idea by definitely scientific reasoning and observation rather than by metaphysical speculation. Valuable both for the reprint and for the scholarly discussion accompanied by bibliographical, historical and scientific detail.

DOROTHY STIMSON

Goucher College

Some Aspects of the Diction of English Poetry. By HENRY CECIL WYLD. Three Lectures Delivered Before the University of London during February 1933 at Westfield College. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1933. Pp. 72. 2s. 6d. Professor H. C. Wyld admits, in the last of these lectures that one of the tasks of a philologist is to relate the earlier to the later stages of a language. This task he performs with characteristic neatness in his examination of words from the four categories into which the poet's vocabulary "naturally" falls: 1. Words common to poetry and prose, 2. Common words well used, 3. Words not used in ordinary prose and 4. Words "unsuited to serious poetry, which nevertheless are sometimes used." Having made these distinctions Professor Wyld permits his interest in etymology to distract his attention from the categories themselves even though the differences between the first two might well repay philological scrutiny. The second part, "Poetry and Change" (the lectures are not printed as delivered), given largely to a discussion of "the pretentious trick of calling things out of their right names," raises still more interesting questions of linguistic function. Unfortunately the questions are not pursued. Differences of opinion on matters of propriety are inevitable: If Dryden was thinking of Hamlet I, 1, 107, the objection to his "rummage" (Ann. Mir. 208) as "inexcusably prosaic" might be modified. Hawes' "pulcrynitude" has become part of American journalese; American readers may detest it for other reasons than those advanced by Professor Wyld. The spelling and pointing of the lines quoted is no more capricious than might be expected in a printed lecture.

R. D. JAMESON

National Tsing Hua University, Peiping, China

Ralph Waldo Emerson: Representative Selections, with Introduction, Bibliography, and Notes. By FREDERIC I. CARPENTER. New York: American Book Company, [1934]. Pp. lviii + 456. In the same series (American Writers Series, Harry Hayden Clark, General Editor): *Nathaniel Hawthorne*, by AUSTIN WARREN, pp. cxii + 368; *Henry Wadsworth Longfellow*, by ODELL SHEPARD, pp. lxiv + 372. This attractively gotten up series, which is to be considerably extended, opens well. The handy little volumes are easy to read and large enough to represent the authors adequately. A useful feature is the select critical bibliographies. The introductions are not perfunctory but thoughtful.

H. S.

RECENT PUBLICATIONS

ENGLISH

[The *English* list includes only books received.]

Barber, O.—H. G. Wells' verhältnis zum Darwinismus. *Leipzig*: Tauchnitz, 1934. Pp. 81. 4 M. (Beiträge zur Englischen Philologie, 27.)

Binyon, L.—The case of Christopher Smart. *London* [and *New York*]: Oxford U. Press, 1934. Pp. 20. \$0.75. (English Association Pamphlet, 90.)

Cookson, G. (ed.)—Essays and studies by members of the Eng. Assoc., XX. *Oxford* [and *New York*]: Oxford U. Press, 1935. Pp. 151. \$2.50.

Dowlin, C. M.—Sir William Davenant's "Gondibert," its preface, and Hobbes's answer. *Philadelphia*: U. of Penn. Press, 1934. Pp. 127. (U. of Penn. diss.)

Elliott, A. P.—Fatalism in the works of Thomas Hardy. *Philadelphia*: U. of Penn. Press, 1935. Pp. 136. (U. of Penn. diss.)

Fullington, J. F., Newdick, R. S., and Wilson, J. H. (eds.)—Purposive prose. *New York*: Heath, 1935. Pp. x + 501. \$2.00.

Gay, Robert M.—Reading and writing. *Boston*: Little, Brown, 1935. Pp. xvi + 268. \$1.25.

Henel, H.—Studien zum altenglischen computus. *Leipzig*: Tauchnitz, 1934. Pp. x + 95. 6 M. (Beiträge zur Englischen Philologie, 26.)

Sells, Iris E.—Matthew Arnold and France. *Cambridge*: U. Press [New York: Macmillan], 1935. Pp. xvi + 282. \$3.50.

Simpson, Percy.—Proof-reading in the 16th, 17th, and 18th centuries. *London* [and *New York*]: Oxford U. Press, 1935. Pp. xii + 251. \$15.00.

Sperry, Willard L.—Wordsworth's anticlimax. *Cambridge*: Harvard U. Press, 1935. Pp. x + 228. \$2.50. (Harvard Studies in Eng., XIII.)

Thielke, K. L. F.—Literatur- und kunst-kritik in ihren wechselbeziehungen. *Halle*: Max Niemeyer, 1935. Pp. 125. 4.80 M. (Studien zur Englischen Philologie, LXXXIV.)

Thieme, Heinz.—Zur verfasserfrage des Dekkerschen stückes "The Pleasant Comedy of Old Fortunatus." *Dresden*: Risse, 1934. Pp. x + 56. 3 M. (U. of Leipzig diss.)

Widenmann, H.—Neuengland in der erzählenden literatur Amerikas. *Halle*: Max Niemeyer, 1935. Pp. xiv + 128. 5.00 M. (Studien zur Englischen Philologie, LXXXVI.)

GERMAN

Baumann, Karl.—Selbstmord und Freitod in sprachlicher und geistesgeschichtlicher Bedeutung. Diss. Giessen, 1933. *Würzburg*: Triltsch, 1934. iv, 49 pp.

Cysarz, Herbert.—Dichtung im Daseinskampf. 5 Vorträge. *Leipzig*: Kraft, 1935. 79 pp. M. 2.20.

Deutsche Literatur. Sammlung literarischer Kunst- und Kulturdenkmäler in Entwicklungsreihen. Reihe: Das deutsche Volkslied. Band 1: Balladen Erster Teil hrsg. von John Meier. *Leipzig*: Reclam, 1935. 289 pp. Cloth, M. 9.

Dichtung und Erlebnis. Zwölf schweizer Schriftsteller erzählen von ihrem Werk und aus ihrem Leben. Mit einer Einführung von Herm. Weilenmann. [Schriften der Zürcher Volkshochschule]. *Zürich, Leipzig*: Niehans [1934]. 160 pp. M. 3.20.

Eggert, Walther.—Christian Weise und seine Bühne. [Germanisch und Deutsch, H. 9]. *Berlin*: de Gruyter, 1935. 381 pp. M. 18.

Eis, Gerhard.—Beiträge zur mhd. Legende und Mystik. Untersuchungen und Texte [Germanische Studien. H. 161]. *Berlin*: Ebering, 1935. 398 pp. M. 16.

Engert, Fritz.—Das stumme Spiel im deutschen Drama von Lessing bis Kleist. Diss. 1928. *Leipzig*: Fromhold & Wendler, 1934. 65 typewritten pp.

Färber, Joh. Michael.—Unbekannte Briefe und Urkunden aus dem Goethekreis. Aus dem Nachlaß Joh. Michael Färbers. Hrsg. von Hinrich Knittermeyer. [Abhandlungen u. Vorträge, hrsg. von d. Bremer Wissenschaftl. Ges. Jg. 7, H. 3/4.—Schriften der Bremer Wissenschaftl. Ges. Reihe D]. *Bremen*: Geist, 1935. xvi, 152 pp. M. 3.

Freie, Magrita J.—Die Einverleibung der fremden Personennamen durch die mhd. höfische Epik. Diss. Groningen. *Amsterdam*: H. J. Paris, 1933. x, 436 pp.

Gabriel, P.—Das deutsche evangelische Kirchenlied. [Wissenschaft und Bildung. 299]. *Leipzig*: Quelle & Meyer, 1935. 143 pp. M. 1.80.

Haag, Karl.—Das Denkgerüst der Sprache. Die Bestandteile des Denkens als d. Grundlagen des Sprachbaus. *Heidelberg*: Winter, 1935. 44 pp. M. 1.

Härlen, Hasso.—Ein baltischer Baron. Tage mit Otto Freiherrn von Taube. *Merseburg*: Stollberg [1935]. 7 pp. 20 Pf.

Huschke, Konrad.—Lenau und die Musik. [Von deutscher Musik. Bd. 35]. *Regensburg*: Bosse [1934]. 112 pp. M. 1.80.

Jensen, Christian.—Hans Friedrich Blunck. Leben und Werk. *Berlin*: Buch-u. Tiefdruck G. m. b. H. [1935]. 164 pp. M. 2.90.

Johnsen, Wilhelm.—Gustav Frenssen. Art und Ahnen. [Jahrbuch d. Ver. f. Dithmarscher Landeskunde, Bd. 13 = Schriften d. Ver. f. Dithmarscher Landeskunde]. *Heide, Westholstein*: Heider Anzeiger, 1934. viii, 174 pp. M. 2.85.

Jungmann, Otto.—Kaspar Hauser. Stoff und Problem in ihrer literarischen Gestaltung. Diss. Frankfurt. *Würzburg*: Triltsch, 1935. iv, 114 pp. M. 3.

Linden, Walther.—Heinrich von Kleist, der Dichter der völkischen Gemeinschaft. [Reclams Universal-Bibl. Nr. 7293]. *Leipzig*: Reclam [1935]. 76 pp. 35 Pf.

Nicolai, Heinz.—Wilhelm Dilthey und das Problem der dichterischen Phantasie. Diss. Leipzig. *München*: C. H. Beck, 1934. Pp. 93-166.

Pauls, Volquart.—Klaus Groth und Emil Kuh's Hebbel-Biographie [Jahresgabe der Hebbelgemeinde. 1934]. *Heide i. H.*: Heider Anzeiger, 1934. vi, 164 pp.

Pongs, Hermann.—Schillers Urbilder. *Stuttgart*: Metzler, 1935. 52 pp. M. 1.75.

Reitmeyer, Elisabeth.—Studien zum Problem der Gedichtsammlung mit eingehender Untersuchung der Gedichtsammlungen Goethes und Tiecks. [Sprache u. Dichtung. H. 57]. *Bern, Leipzig*: Haupt, 1935. 258 pp. M. 6.50.

Richter, Fritz.—Otto Ludwigs Trauerpielplan "Tiberius Gracchus" u. sein Zusammenhang mit den "Shakespeare-Studien" [Sprache u. Kultur d. german. u. roman. Völker. B, Bd. 12]. *Breslau*: Priebatsch, 1935. vii, 89 pp. M. 5.40.

Rothermel, Otto.—Friedrich Schlegel und Fichte. [Gießener Beiträge zur deutschen Philologie. 36]. *Giessen*: von Münchow, 1934. 47 pp. M. 2.50.

Scharmann, Th.—Studien über die Saelde in der ritterlichen Dichtung des 12. u. 13. Jhs. Diss. Frankfurt. *Würzburg*: Triltsch, 1935. v, 95 pp. M. 3.

Scherer, Baptist.—Zur Einführung der direkten Rede in neuhochdeutscher Prosa. Diss. Marburg, 1932. *Emsdetten, Westf.*: H. u. J. Lechte, 1935. xii, 108 pp. M. 3.50.

Scherrer, Paul.—Zum Kampfmotiv bei Thomas Murner (1520-1522). *Basel*: Schwabe, 1935. 27 pp.

Schneider, Helene.—Sprache und Vers von Kleists "Amphitryon" und seiner französischen Vorlage. Diss. Frankfurt, 1933. *Gelnhausen*: Kalbfleisch, 1934. 67 pp.

Schopp, Joseph.—Das deutsche Arbeitslied. [Germ. Bibl. Abt. 2, Bd. 38]. *Heidelberg*: Winter, 1935. x, 376 pp. M. 18.

Teuchert, Hermann.—Niederdeutsche Mundarten. Texte aus alter u. neuer Zeit. [Volkskundliche Texte. H. 4]. *Leipzig*: Eichblatt [1935]. 124 pp. M. 3.20.

Unger, Rudolf.—Gervinus und die Anfänge der politischen Literaturgeschichtsschreibung in Deutschland. Eine Säkularerinnerung. Rede. [Nachrichten von d. Ges. d. Wiss. zu Göttingen. Phil.-hist. Kl. Fachgr. 4, N. F. Bd. 1, Nr. 5]. *Berlin*: Weidmann, 1935. Pp. 71-94. M. 1.

Vriesen, Hellmuth.—Die Stationentechnik im neueren deutschen Drama. Diss. Kiel. *Essen*: Petersen, 1934. 88 pp.

Waller, Martha.—Lessings Erziehung des Menschengeschlechts. Interpretation u. Darstellung ihres rationalen u. irrationalen Gehaltes. Eine Auseinandersetzung mit der Lessingforschung. [Germanische Studien. H. 160]. *Berlin*: Ebering, 1935. 202 pp. M. 7.80.

Wasmandorff, Erich.—Alte deutsche Berufsamen und ihre Bedeutung [Schriftenreihe Sippenforschung. H. 6]. *Görlitz*: Starke, 1935. v, 50 pp. M. 1.

Wetzel, Ernst.—Der Kolumbus-Stoff im deutschen Geistesleben. [Sprache u. Kultur d. german. u. roman. Völker. B, Bd. 13]. *Breslau*: Priebatsch, 1935. ix, 88 pp. M. 4.80.

FRENCH

Albrechts, W.—Bezeichnungen von Kraftwagen und Kraftwagen-Bestandteilen im Fr. Diss. *Hamburg*: 1934. vii + 91 pp.

Ascoli, G.—Réponse à quelques détracteurs de V. Hugo. *Paris*: Droz, 1935. 18 pp. Fr. 10.

Aykroyd, Phyllis.—The Dramatic art of la Compagnie des quinze. *London*: Part-ridge (1935). 63 pp. 2 s. 6 d.

Beyer, C.—Die Verba des 'Essens,' 'Schickens,' 'Kaufens,' und 'Findens' in ihrer Geschichte vom Latein bis in die rom. Sprachen. Diss. *Leipzig*: 67 pp.

Brahm, A. de.—Cent ans de poésie, 1830-1930. *Paris*: Piton, 1933. 71 pp. Fr. 5.

Brennan, Donal.—La conversion de J.-K. Huysmans et son œuvre religieuse. *Montpellier*: Carias, 1933. 147 pp.

Brunet, G.—V. Hugo. *Paris*: Rieder, 1935. 100 pp. Fr. 16.50.

Buckenmaier, A.—Die Mundart von Camarès (Aveyron). Diss. *Tübingen*: 1934. 125 pp.

Chanson de Roland, La. Pubbl. da G. Bertoni. Introduzione, testo, versione, note, glossario. *Firenze*: L. S. Olschki, 1935. 502 pp. L. 40.

Chapuy, P.—Origine des noms patronymiques fr., suiv. d'une étude sur les noms de famille basque. *Paris*: Dorbon-Ainé, 1935. 352 pp. Fr. 60.

Corneille.—Théâtre, éd. P. Lièvre. 2 vol. *Paris*: Nouv. Rev. fr., 1934. 1049 + 1119 pp. Fr. 130.

Davray, J.—George Sand et ses amants. *Paris*: Michel, 1935. 320 pp. Fr. 15.

Delahaye, E.—La part de Verlaine et Rimbaud dans le sentiment relig. contemp. *Paris*: Messein, 1935. 128 pp. Fr. 9.

Dengler, B.—Die Mundart von St. Vincent de Tyrosse und Umgebung (Landes). Diss. *Tübingen*: 1934. 67 pp.

Dimier, L.—Le nationalisme litt. et ses méfaits chez les Fr. *Paris*: Corrèa, 1935. 208 pp. Fr. 12.

Escholier, R.—V. Hugo et les femmes. *Paris*: Flammarion, 1935. 128 pp. Fr. 3.75.

Escoffier, M.—Le Mouvement romantique (1788-1850). Essai de bibliog. *Paris*: Maison du bibliophile, 1934. lxxii + 431 pp.

Fabureau, H.—S. Mallarmé. *Paris*: Nouv. Rev. crit., 1933. 97 pp. Fr. 9.

Fahmy, D.—Ch. Poncey, poète maçon (1821-91). *Paris*: Presses univ., 1935. 140 pp. Fr. 20.

Fleuret, F.—De Ronsard à Baudelaire. *Paris*: Mercure de Fr., 1935. 293 pp. Fr. 15.

Frese, F.—Allegorische und mythologische Gestalten in den Dichtungen E. Deschamps'. Diss. *Münster*: 1934. vii + 85 pp.

Friedenberg, Janice.—The Teacher in the modern theatre of France. Columbia diss. *Paris*: Presses modernes, 1934. 182 pp.

Garric, R.—Albert de Mun. *Paris*: Flammarion, 1935. 252 pp. Fr. 12.

Graux, L.—Les Factures de la Dame aux camélias. *Paris*: Ficker, 1935. 77 pp. Fr. 30.

Haumer, H.—Syntax und Flexion des Verbums in den aquilanischen Chroniken. *Leipzig*: Gronau, 1934. viii + 98 pp.

Heidel, G.—La langue et le style de Ph. de Commines. *Paris*: Droz, 1934. 182 pp.

Jourda, P.—Stendhal. *Paris*: Desclée, de Brouwer, 1934. 297 pp.

Kutscha, K.—Das sogenannte N-mobile im Alt- und Neuprovenzalischen. *Halle*: Niemeyer, 1934. xiv + 137 pp.

Le Loyer, Pierre.—Œuvres poétiques, éd. J. Turquais. *Angers*: Impr. de l'Ouest, 1934. 32 pp. Fr. 5.

Livaudais-Samson.—Mon guide pour apprendre à lire, à écrire et à parler fr. *Boston*: Heath, 1935. xvi + 549 pp.

Mabille de Poncheville.—V. Conrart. *Paris*: Mercure de Fr., 1935. 224 pp. Fr. 12.

Maupassant.—Œuvres complètes, éd. R. Dumesnil. T. I. *Paris*: Libr. de Fr., 1934. xxvii + 391 pp.

Mélanges de litt., philologie et hist. offerts à M. Louis Arnould par ses élèves et ses amis. *Poitiers*: Soc. fr. d'imprim., 1934. xxiv + 344 pp. Fr. 60.

Mélèse, P.—Le théâtre et le public à Paris sous Louis XIV, 1659-1715. *Paris*: Droz, 1934. x + 466 pp. (Bibl. de la Soc. des historiens du théâtre, VI.)

—Répertoire analytique des documents

contemporains concernant le théâtre à Paris sous Louis XIV. *Ibid.*, 1934. 237 pp. (Id.) Fr. 80 for the two vols.

Mériot, B.—Les Noms de famille dans l'ancien pays de Montbéliard. *Montbéliard*: Impr. montbéliardaise, 1934. 137 pp.

Miéville, H.-L.—La pensée de M. Barrès. *Paris*: Nouv. Rev. crit., 1934. 253 pp. Fr. 12.

Rabelais.—Sa vie et son œuvre, éd. en vieux fr. et adaptation en fr. mod. par R. Mortier. 5 vol. xxxv + 1907 pp.

Rahn, O.—La Croisade contre le Graal. *Paris*: Stock, 1935. 288 pp. Fr. 18.

Rambaud, Alfred.—Petite hist. de la civilisation fr. *Paris*: A. Colin, 1934. 325 pp.

Rech, B.—Grundbegriffe und Wertbegriffe bei Montaigne. *Berlin*: Ebering, 1934. 112 pp.

Rohe, A.—Die Terminologie der Fischer-sprache von Grau d'Agde (Hérault). Diss. *Tübingen*: 1934. x + 75 pp.

Sabin, I.—Die Bezeichnungen der Streu im Galloromanischen. Diss. *Berlin*: 1935. 70 pp.

Schollmeyer, V.—Flaubert in seinem Verhältnis zu Montaigne. *Greifswald*: Dallmeyer, 1934. 64 pp.

Schulz, Agnes.—Die Sprachkunst Th. Gautiers. Diss. *Münster*: 1934. 68 pp.

Seillière, E.—A. France, critique de son temps. *Paris*: Nouv. Rev. crit., 1934. 255 pp. Fr. 12.

—La Jeunesse d'A. France. *Ibid.*, 1934. 254 pp. Fr. 12.

Strowski, F.—Le théâtre et nous. *Paris*: Nouv. Rev. crit., 1934. 223 pp. Fr. 12.

Szarota, E. M.—Studien zu Gautier de Coincy. Diss. *Frankfurt*: 1934. 68 pp.

Thomasson.—Naissance et vicissitudes de 300 mots et locutions. *Paris*: Delagrave, 1935. 184 pp. Fr. 10.

Vanwelkenhuyzen, G.—J.-K. Huysmans et la Belgique. *Paris*: Mercure de Fr., 1935. viii + 230 pp.

Yon or la Venjance Fromondin, a 13th-century chanson de geste, ed. S. R. Mitchneck. *New York*: Inst. of Fr. Studies, 1935. xxvi + 224 pp. \$2.25.

Zévaès, A.—Maurice Rollinat. Son œuvre. *Paris*: Nouv. Rev. crit., 1933. 96 pp. Fr. 9.

ITALIAN

Aliquò-Lenzi, L.—Diego Vitrioli. *Reggio Calabria*: Tip. "Fata Morgana," 1934. 48 pp. (Municipio di Reggio Calabria. Letture mensili alla Biblioteca comunale, lettura XX.)

Amrein-Widmer, Martha.—Rhythmus als Ausdruck inneren Erlebens in Dantes Divina Commedia. *Zürich-Leipzig-Stuttgart*: Rascher und Cie., 1933. 142 pp.

Barbieri, F.—Pagine storiche e politiche (di Cesare Balbo, Vincenzo Gioberti, Giuseppe Mazzini) scelte e annotate da —. *Torino*: Soc. editr. internazionale, 1934. viii + 114 pp. L. 15. (Scrittori italiani commentati per le scuole.)

Belloni, A.—Galileo Galilei (1561-1642). Con brani scelti di G. Galilei. *Torino*: G. B. Paravia e C., 1933. 112 pp. L. 5.25. (Scrittori italiani con note storiche e analisi estetiche.)

Berzero, G.—Vita di Giosuè Borsi. Introduzione di G. Tumiatì. *Milano*: "Ara," edit. di G. Gasparini, 1933. 224 pp. L. 6.

Bestazzi, Edvige.—Ugo Foscolo, patriota e poeta. Solenne commemorazione centenaria tenuta all'Istituto fascista di cultura di Novara e Vicenza. *Varese*: Ist. edit. Cisalpino, 1934. 42 pp.

Bezzola, R. R.—Spirito e forma nei canti di Giacomo Leopardi. *Zürich*: 1933. 127 pp. (Habilitationsschrift.)

Brill, J.—Der Liber pontificalis des Agnellus von Ravenna. Kulturelles und Sprachliches. *Bochum-Langendreer*: H. Pöppinghaus, 1933. x + 118 pp. (Münster Dissertation.)

Camaiti, V.—Sentenze e massime dei più grandi prosatori e poeti italiani, raccolte da —, con brevi cenni sulla vita e sulle opere degli autori. *Firenze*: A. Vallecchi, 1934. 389 pp. L. 10. (Opere postume di V. Camaiti, II.)

Carmody, F. J.—Franco-Italian Sources of the Roncesvalles. *New York*: The Institute of French Studies, 1934. 33 pp.

Cellini, Benvenuto.—La vita, scritta da lui medesimo. Nuova edizione scolastica con note e illustrazioni per cura di F. Zublena. *Torino*: Soc. editr. Internazionale, 1934. xxi + 502 pp. L. 15. (Scrittori italiani commentati per le scuole.)

Chiocchetti, E.—La filosofia di Giambattista Vico. Saggi. *Milano*: "Vita e pensiero," 1935. vii + 198 pp. L. 10.

Farinelli, A.—Ariosto. Gedenkrede zur Vierhundertjahrfeier seines Todes. *Köln*: Petrarca-Haus-Kommissionsverlag J. P. Bachem, 1934. 26 pp. (Veröffentlichungen des Petrarca-Hauses, zweite Reihe, Vorträge, 5.)

Fortunato (Giustino), 1848-1932. *Roma*: Ediz. dell'Archivio stor. per la Calabria e Lucania, 1932. 283 pp. L. 30.

Fuchs, Clara Charlotte.—Dante in der deutschen Romantik. *Weimar*: H. Böhlau Nachf., 1933. Pp. 61-134. (Marburg Dissertation.)

Giordano, A., e Giovannucci, L.—Il novecento letterario. Collana di studi critico-biografici intorno alla vita ed alle opere di scrittori italiani di ogni scuola e tendenza.

Vol. I. *S. Giuseppe Vesuviano*: "I quaderni di Athena," 1934. xiv + 167 pp. L. 8.

Giusti, Giuseppe.—Prose e poesie scelte, a uso delle scuole medie, per cura di E. Ceria. *Torino*: Soc. editr. internazionale, 1933. xiv + 230 pp. L. 7.

Gloth, Annelise.—Der übertragene Gebrauch von Verwandtschaftsnamen bei Dante. *Bonn*: 1934. 60 pp.

Goldoni, Carlo.—Il burbero benefico: commedia. Con introduzione e commento a cura di G. Bottoni. *Milano*: C. Signorelli, 1933. 53 pp. L. 2.

— La famiglia dell'antiquario: commedia in tre atti. Con introduzione e commento a cura di G. Bottoni. *Milano*: C. Signorelli, 1933. 80 pp. L. 3.

Grizzuti, U.—Le "Pentamerone" de G. B. Basile et "Les Contes de ma mère l'Oye" de C. Perrault. Considérations. *Roma*: Albrighi, Segati e C., 1934. 51 pp.

Häge, Liselotte.—Lo Cunto de li Cunti di Giambattista Basile. Eine Stilstudie. 1933. 79 pp. (Tübingen Dissertation.)

Hefti, Fridolin.—Giosuè Carducci als Dichter der Natur. *Bern*: 1934. 109 pp.

Hutton, J.—The Greek Anthology in Italy to the Year 1800. *Ithaca, N. Y.*: Cornell University Press, 1935. xi + 663 pp. \$3.00. (Cornell Studies in English, XXIII.)

Keyser, S.—Contribution à l'étude de la fortune littéraire de l'Arioste en France. *Leiden*: M. Dubbeldeman, 1933. 225 pp.

Lépiciér, A. H. M.—La Vierge Marie dans le poème de Dante. Avec un appendice sur l'image de l'Annonciation de Florence à propos d'une description de Dante dans son Purgatoire. *Rome*: Imprimerie Augustinienne, 1934. 85 pp.

Lipsker, Erika.—Der Mythos vom goldenen Zeitalter in den Schäferdichtungen Italiens, Spaniens und Frankreichs zur Zeit der Renaissance. *Berlin*: 1934. 103 pp.

Lombard, A.—Le groupement des pronoms personnels régimes atones en italien. *Uppsala*: Almqvist & Wiksells, 1934. 58 pp. (Studier i modern Språkvetenskap, XII.)

Lombardo, G. M.—Canti nazionali e patriottici del popolo italiano. Testo e commenti ad uso delle scuole e delle famiglie a cura di —. *Clusone*: Tip. Giudici, 1934. 127 pp. L. 3.

Markun, H.—Ital. "ire" und "andare." *Aarau*: H. R. Sauerländer & Cie., 1932. 108 pp. (Zürich Dissertation.)

Mazzini, Giuseppe.—Scritti scelti. A cura di A. Omodeo. *Milano-Verona*: A. Mondadori, 1934. 222 pp. L. 7. (Edizioni Mondadori per le scuole medie.)

Mazzoni, G.—L'ottocento. Terza edizione completamente rifatta. *Milano*: F. Valardi, 1934. 2 vols., xx + vii + 1,472 pp.

L. 55 each volume. (Storia letteraria d'Italia.)

Merlo, C.—Note fonetiche sul dialetto franco-provenzale di Valtournanche (Aosta). *Pisa*: Tip. F. Simoncini, 1934. 62 pp. (Repr. fr. "L'Italia dialettale," X.)

Micale, Olga.—Thomas Gray e la sua influenza sulla letteratura italiana. Con prefazione di N. Busetto. *Catania*: Studio edit. moderno, 1934. viii + 318 pp. L. 12.

Palgen, R.—Das Quellenproblem der Göttlichen Komödie. *Heidelberg*: Winter, 1933. 40 pp.

—Neue Beiträge zum Quellenproblem der Göttlichen Komödie. *Heidelberg*: Winter, 1933. 46 pp.

Patetta, F.—Un terzo testo della "Nencia da Barberino" attribuita a Lorenzo de' Medici. *Roma*: G. Bardi, 1934. 35 pp. (Repr. fr. the "Rendiconti della classe di scienze morali, storiche e filologiche della r. Accademia dei Lincei," serie VI, vol. X, fasc. 3-4.)

Popescu-Telega, A.—Cervantes și Italia. Studii de literatură comparată. *Craiova*: Ramuri, 1933. 212 pp.

Porta, Carlo.—Poesie scelte. Introduzione ed esplanazione in prosa di A. Ottolini. *Milano*: C. Signorelli, 1934. 159 pp. L. 3. (Biblioteca di letteratura, n. 333-335.)

Rabow, H.—Die "Asolanischen Gespräche" des Pietro Bembo. Eine literaturgeschichtliche Studie zum Kulturproblem der italienischen Renaissance. *Berlin-Leipzig*: Akademische Buchhandlung Paul Haupt, 1934. vii + 80 pp.

Rheinfelder, H.—Kultussprache und Profansprache in den romanischen Ländern. Sprachgeschichtliche Studien, besonders zum Wortschatz des Französischen und des Italienischen. *Genève-Firenze*: L. S. Olschki, 1933. x + 481 pp. L. 40. (Biblioteca dell' "Archivum romanicum," serie II, vol. 18.)

Ritter, Helene.—Das Leben des italienischen Freiheitsdichters Silvio Pellico. *Zürich-Leipzig-Stuttgart*: Rascher, 1933. 120 pp.

Sapegno, N.—Il Trecento. 3a edizione completamente rifatta. *Milano*: F. Vallardi, 1934. vii + 640 pp. L. 55. (Storia letteraria d'Italia.)

Schild, Marion.—Die Musikdramen Ottavio Rinuccinis. *Würzburg*: R. Mayr, 1933. 59 pp. (München Dissertation.)

Schwartz, J. A.—The Commedia dell'arte and its Influence on French Comedy in the Seventeenth Century. *New York*: Publications of the Institute of French Studies, 1934. 192 pp.

Segafredo, Albertina Ines.—Il volo di Icaro in Ovidio e in Gabriele D'Annunzio. *Bassano del Grappa*: Tip. A. Vicenzi, 1934. 33 pp.

Serra, G. D.—Contributo toponomastico alla teoria della continuità nel medio evo delle comunità rurali romane e preromane dell'Italia superiore. *Cluj*: Cartea Românească, 1933. 325 pp. (Biblioteca Dacoromaniei condusă de S. Pușcariu, IV.)

Serra, R.—Epistolario. A cura di L. Ambrosini, G. De Robertis, A. Grilli. *Firenze*: F. Le Monnier, 1934. 614 pp. L. 25.

Settembrini, Luigi.—Ricordanze della mia vita. A cura di A. Omodeo. *Bari*: G. Laterza e figli, 1934. xv + 436 pp. L. 20. (Collezione scolastica Laterza.)

Sonne, I.—Intorno alla vita di Leone Ebreo. *Firenze*: Civiltà moderna, 1934. 37 pp. L. 6. (Quaderni di critica, II.)

Strauss, Lotte.—Uebersetzungen italienischer Dichtwerke in Frankreich zwischen 1789 und 1820. *Heidelberg*: 1923. 127 pp.

Titone, V.—La poesia del Pascoli e la critica italiana. *Roma*: Albrighi, Segati e C., 1934. 135 pp. L. 6.

Trabalza, C., e Zucchetti, G.—Liriche dell'Ottocento, con notizie essenziali di metrica e con note bio-bibliografiche. *Torino*: G. B. Paravia e C., 1934. 172 pp. L. 7.50.

Vella, Angela.—Antonio Fogazzaro nelle sue opere. Saggio critico. *Catania*: G. Prigioni, 1934. 31 pp. L. 3.

SPANISH AND PORTUGUESE

Alarcón, P. A. de.—El carbonero alcalde. *Madrid*: Edit. Ugoiti, 1935. 0.30 ptas.

—El sombrero de tres picos. *Barcelona*: Gustavo Gili, 1934. 234 pp. 250 ptas. (Ediciones "La Cometa.")

Alcalá Zamora, N.—El Derecho y sus colindancias en el teatro de Don Juan Ruiz de Alarcón. *Madrid*: Tip. de Archivos, 1934. 85 pp.

Alonso Cortés, N.—Las cien mejores poesías del siglo XIX, escogidas por. . . *Valladolid*: Gráficas Aguado, 1934. 272 pp.

Altamirano.—Selección de sus obras. *México*: Secretaría de Educación pública, 1934. 137 pp.

Arco y Garay, R.—La erudición aragonesa en el siglo XVII en torno a Lastanosa. *Madrid*: Cuerpo facultativo de Archiveros, 1934. 373 pp.

Artigas, M.—El purismo. *Madrid*: Imp. Aguirre, 1935. 70 pp.

Cervantes.—Aventuras de don Quijote. Ed. by H. Alpern and J. Martel. *New York*: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1935. xi + 244 pp. \$1.12.

Chabás, J.—Vuelo y estilo. Estudios de literatura contemporánea. Tomo I: G. Miró, J. R. Jiménez, A. y M. Machado. *Madrid*: Sociedad General Española de Librería, 1934. 160 pp.

Cortés, F.—Despatches from Mexico to Charles V. Ed. by A. G. Day. *New York*: American Book Company, 1935. xxviii + 144 pp. \$1.00.

Donoso Cortés, J.—Pensamientos. Sel. y pról. de M. Fernández Núñez. *Madrid*: Edit. Bruno del Amo, 1934. 239 pp. 7 ptas.

Doyle, H. G.—A tentative bibliography of the belles-lettres of Panama. *Cambridge, Mass.*: Harvard University Press, 1934. 21 pp.

Feliú Cruz, G.—En torno de Ricardo Palma. I: La estancia en Chile. II: Ensayo crítico-bibliográfico. *Santiago de Chile*: Prensas de la Universidad, 1933. 255 y 399 pp.

Galdós.—Selección, prólogo y precedente histórico por Margarita Mayo. 2a ed. *Madrid*: Instituto Escuela, 1935. 224 pp. 4 ptas. (Biblioteca del estudiante, V.)

Goyanes Capdevila, J.—La sátira contra los médicos y la Medicina en los libros de Quevedo. *Madrid*: [Academia de Medicina], 1934. 30 pp.

Gutiérrez Eskildsen, R. M.—Prosodia y fonética tabasqueñas. *México*: Edit. Universidad Autónoma, 1934. 68 pp.

Jovellanos, M. G. de.—Obras escogidas. Intr. y notas de Angel del Río. 2 vols. *Madrid*: Espasa-Calpe, 1935. 290 y 250 pp.

Le Gentil, G.—La littérature portugaise. *Paris*: Lib. Armand Colin, 1935. 208 pp. 10.50 frs.

León, Fr. Luis de.—Páginas escogidas. Selección y notas de L. Santa Marina. *Barcelona*: Edit. Luis Miracle, 1934. 222 pp. 7 ptas. (Colección "Merges." Antologías de clásicos castellanos.)

López Landa, J. M.—El ingenio de Gracián. Sus mejores agudezas y sentencias . . . ordenadas por materias. *Zaragoza*: Biblioteca Gracián, 1933. 146 pp.

—Escritores aragoneses olvidados. *Zaragoza*: Tip. "La Académica," 1933.

Marcial Dorado, C.—Pasitos. *New York*: Harper & Bros., 1935. xviii + 387 pp. \$1.48.

Marquina, E.—La Dorotea, comedia en verso, inspirada en la famosa obra de Lope de Vega. *Madrid*: Edit. Reus, 1935. 260 pp. 5 ptas.

Menéndez Pidal, R.—Historia troyana, en prosa y verso, texto de hacia 1270, pub. por . . . *Madrid*: Junta para Ampliación de Estudios, 1934. xlix + 225 pp. 15 ptas. (R. F. E., Anejo XVIII.)

Millares Carlo, A.—Los códices visigóticos de la Catedral toledana. *Madrid*: Talls. Hernando, 1935. 120 pp. (Discurso de ingreso en la Academia de la Historia.)

Montesinos, J. F.—Cadalso o la noche cerrada. *Madrid*: Cruz y Raya, 1934.

Montoto, S.—El Arenal de Sevilla en la

Historia y en la literatura. *Sevilla*: S. Domínguez, imp., 1934. 51 pp.

Núñez Cabeza de Vaca, A.—Naufragios y comentarios. 2a ed. *Madrid*: Espasa-Calpe, 1934. 5 ptas.

Paz y Melia, A.—Catálogo de las piezas de teatro que se conservan en el dept. de mss. de la Biblioteca Nacional. Tomo I, segunda ed. *Madrid*: Patronato de la Biblioteca Nacional, 1934. 700 pp.

Porras Barrenechea, R.—Pequeña Antología de Lima (1535-1935). Lisonja y vejamen de la ciudad de los Reyes del Perú, cronistas, viajeros y poetas, recopilada por. . . *Madrid*: Galo Sáez, 1935. 355 pp. 8 ptas.

Raphael, M. I. and J. D. M. Ford.—A tentative bibliography of Paraguayan literature. *Cambridge, Mass.*: Harvard University Press, 1934. xi + 25 pp.

Reyes, R.—Historia sucinta de la literatura francesa. (Textos en francés.) 9a ed. reformada y ampliada. *Madrid*: Imp. Castilla, 1935. 256 pp. 8 ptas.

Ruiz de Alarcón, J.—La verdad sospechosa. *México*: Publicaciones de la Biblioteca Dramática del Palacio de Bellas Artes, 1934. xxiv + 135 pp.

Sáinz de Robles, F.—Elipando y Sáiz Beato de Liébana. (Antología.) *Madrid*: Edit. Aguilar, 1935. 244 pp. 6 ptas. (Biblioteca de la Cultura Española.)

Sánchez Pérez, J. A.—Alfonso X el Sabio. *Madrid*: Edit. Aguilar, 1935. 299 pp. 6 ptas.

Ugarte, M. y M. Latorre.—Tres cuentos sud-americanos. Ed. by S. E. Leavitt. *New York*: F. S. Crofts, 1935. xv + 163 pp. \$1.00.

Vega, Lope de.—Cancionero divino. Antología de lírica sagrada. Edición centenario (1635-1935). *Madrid*: Edit. Apostolado de la Prensa, 1935. 228 pp. 3 ptas.

—Los melindres de Belisa. [Ed. crítica por] H. C. Barrau. *Amsterdam*: H. J. Paris, 1933. 278 pp.

Waxman, S. M.—A bibliography of the belles-lettres of Venezuela. *Cambridge, Mass.*: Harvard University Press 1935. xii + 145 pp.

GENERAL

Entwistle and Tancock.—The Year's Work in mod. lang. studies. V. [N. Y. and] *London*: Oxford Univ. Press, 1935. viii + 214 pp. \$2.50.

Kurtz, L. P.—The Dance of Death and the macabre spirit in European lit. Columbia diss. *New York*: Inst. of Fr. Studies, 1934. 302 pp.

Servien, P.—Principes d'esthétique, problèmes d'art et langage des sciences. *Paris*: Boivin, 1935. viii + 228 pp. Fr. 18.

S.

y
e,as
le
I,
o-n-
y
d,
r.
8A
a-
tyra
e-
a,a.
ca
4.iz
t:
o-o.
6os
w
p.n-
io
leca
J.he
e.
iiirk
ll
+he
ia
4.o-
s:

A HISTORY OF FRENCH DRAMATIC LITERATURE IN THE SEVENTEENTH CENTURY

Part II. The Period of Corneille (1635-1651)

BY HENRY CARRINGTON LANCASTER

These two volumes are concerned with some 280 plays, written between the time when Corneille's first tragedy appeared and his temporary retirement from dramatic composition at the end of 1651. The period is that in which the theatre became, for the first time in modern France, the principal means of literary expression, in which a definite type of tragedy, differing from that of the Ancients and from those of the sixteenth century and of Racine, was created, in which tragi-comedy continued to flourish, and in which comedy became more and more significant. It contains certain works of great importance in the history of European culture and the germs of others that were to supersede them. *Two volumes, 804 pages, crown 8vo, \$10.00.*

PRESS COMMENTS UPON PART I

The Pre-Classical Period (1610-1634)

"Such a monument of industry as can only now be expected from scholars of a younger race. . . . The French classical period has left a deep and permanent impression upon the dramatic history of the modern world, and we find it here in the making."

The Times Literary Supplement.

"His new work fills one with admiration at its thoroughness and its scholarly workmanship . . . a remarkable book, to the excellences of which I hope I have served as a modest signpost."

Modern Language Review.

Two volumes, 785 pages, crown 8vo, \$10.00.

Chateaubriand's *Les Natchez*

Publiés avec une Introduction et des Notes par GILBERT CHINARD avec l'assistance de Chandler B. Beall, Charles R. Hart, Meta H. Miller, Louis H. Naylor, et J. Van Ness Smead

557 pages, 16 illustrations, 8vo, cloth, \$3.50

This is a critical edition of Chateaubriand's prose epic, which has not hitherto received the attention it fully deserves. In his introduction, Professor Chinard shows clearly that *Les Natchez* should be regarded as a precious autobiographical document which enables one to follow step by step Chateaubriand's "progress" towards christianity between the publication of the *Essai sur les Révolutions*, and his final conversion. A careful analysis of the character of René permits a true reconstruction of Chateaubriand's inner life during those troubled years of his adolescence.

The date of composition of *Les Natchez* has received special attention, and a thorough investigation of the "sources" has been made. They range from the Bible, Virgil and Tasso, to Milton and Ossian; occasionally Plato is used, while the local color is largely borrowed from the French Jesuits Charlevoix and Lafitau, as well as from the American traveler, Bartram.

In addition to the texts, Chateaubriand occasionally used engravings found in old books as his source material; these illustrations, reproduced in this edition, add materially to its attractiveness.

Finally, it will be noted that the text exactly follows the edition of 1827 established by Chateaubriand for his *Oeuvres Complètes*. The original spelling and punctuation have been retained and will enable the reader to reconstitute the rhythm given by Chateaubriand to his sentences when he read them aloud.

THE JOHNS HOPKINS PRESS • BALTIMORE

Indispensable for modern language teachers

OLIVER: THE MODERN LANGUAGE TEACHER'S HANDBOOK

A *vade mecum* of suggestions, references, and information for teachers of French, German, Italian, Spanish, Portuguese, and the Scandinavian languages; for advanced students and librarians. (Published April, 1935)

• • •

SERONDE AND PEYRE: THREE CLASSIC FRENCH PLAYS

LE CID · LES PRÉCIEUSES RIDICULES · ANDROMAQUE
(In press)

BURKHARD: VIER KLEINE LUSTSPIELE

Rosen's EIN KNOFF · Wilhelmi's EINER MUSS HEIRATEN! : Benedix' EIGENSINN · Fulda's UNTER VIER AUGEN. (Published May, 1935)

BOGGS AND CASTILLO: LEYENDAS ÉPICAS DE ESPAÑA

RODRIGO EL ÚLTIMO GODO · BERNARDO DEL CARPIO · LOS SIETE INFANTES DE SALAS · FERNÁN GONZÁLEZ · EL CERCO DE ZAMORA · EL CID. (*The Heath-Chicago Language Series*)
(In press)

D. C. HEATH AND COMPANY

Boston New York Chicago Atlanta San Francisco Dallas London



MÜLLER-PARTENKIRCHEN: KAUM GENÜGEND

Edited by Mrs. HEDWIG LESER

Ten *Schulgeschichten* ranging from light comedy to tragedy. Notes are paged with the text; supplementary exercises and a complete

**SCHÄFER:
STORIES OF
THE RHINE**

Edited by G. H. DANTON

Twenty selections from the *Rheinsagen*, chosen for their interest, representativeness, novelty and ease. Exercises which really give practise in the use of idioms, in the formation of words, in the acquisition of vocabulary and in necessary classroom drill are an outstanding feature. List Price: 92c

vocabulary are provided. We recommend this book for use in high school and college classes soon after the essentials of grammar have been completed.

List
Price:
88c

HENRY HOLT AND CO., 1 Park Ave., New York